School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1404137

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

BX
821
L3

A

MANUAL OF COUNCILS

OF THE

Holy Catholick Church,

COMPRISING THE SUBSTANCE OF

THE MOST REMARKABLE AND IMPORTANT

CANONS,

ALPHABETICALLY ARRANGED.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD H. LANDON, M.A.

LATE OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1846.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

L.C.- 38-12917

PREFACE.

The following work is intended to supply, in some measure, what appears to be a desideratum to the English reader, viz. a *compendious* account of the Councils of the Church. This I had originally purposed to do by a translation of a small French work, published anonymously, at Paris, in 1773, in one volume, entitled, "Dictionnaire Portatif des Conciles," but when the task had been commenced, so many alterations and additions appeared to be needed, that I resolved so far to abandon my first design as to make the French work merely the groundwork of a more extended volume on the same plan. Thus, although the work alluded to has furnished no small part of the present book, very considerable alterations have been made in it, and not only has much fresh matter been added relating to the councils contained in that work, but an account has also been given of many others which it passes over in silence, especially those which, although not recognized by the Church of Rome, are not the less regarded by other branches of the Church.

The materials with which I have had to work were unhappily scanty, and some apology may seem to be due for attempting a work of this nature, while debarred, as in this place I have been, from many of those

authorities which it would have been desirable to have consulted; but the reader will bear in mind that the present book pretends only to be of an elementary character, and reference has, in almost every case, been given to the larger works of Labbe and Wilkins; I may also add, that I believe the work, as far as it goes, will be found to be accurate; the account of every council having been verified either by myself, whilst in England, or by my friend, the Rev. William Pridden, to whom my sincere thanks are due for this and other valuable assistance: and also to the Rev. J. M. Neale, who kindly permitted me the use of the MS. of his history of the Oriental Church.

Nor would I omit to mention my obligation to the reverend the canon Ant. J. F. Pestana, rector of the seminary of Funchal, for his courtesy in allowing me, at all times, free access to the valuable library attached to that Institution, and to the Rev. E. M. Johnson, rector of Brooklyn, New York, for some useful documents relating to the convocations of the Church, in the United States of America.

Madeira, 1845.

MANUAL OF COUNCILS.

A.

ABERDEEN. [*Concilium Aberdonense.*] An assembly of the bishops of the Church in Scotland was held at Aberdeen, April 24, 1788, to take into consideration the state of the Church. In this synod it was unanimously agreed to comply with and submit to the government of the house of Hanover; and to testify this compliance by uniformly praying for George III., by name, at public worship. This resolution was duly intimated to the clergy and laity of their respective dioceses, the clergy being required to make public notification to their respective congregations on the 18th of the following month, that on the succeeding Lord's-day, a prayer for the king would be authoritatively introduced, and from that time continued in all the religious assemblies of the Church; finally, they exhorted all persons in their communion to receive cordially this determination of their spiritual fathers.—*Bp. Skinner, Eccl. Hist. Scotland,* vol. ii. p. 689. Aberdeen, 1788.

AFRICA. [*Concilium Africanum.*] Held in 217, by Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, and attended by all the bishops of Africa and Numidia. In this council it was declared, that those who have received the form of baptism out of the Church, may not be admitted into it without being baptized.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 607 [1]. Africa, 217.

AFRICA (or CARTHAGE). Held in 254 upon the case of those who had relapsed into idolatry during the persecution. The circumstances which led to the assembling of this council were as follows: Novatus, a Africa, 254.

[1] This and all similar references are to Labbe and Cossart, Concilia Sacrosancta, in 16 tomes, *ed.* Paris, 1671.

Africa, 254. priest of the Church of Carthage, in order to avoid the just punishment of his crimes, joined himself, together with five other priests, to the party of Felicissimus, a deacon of Carthage, who had set himself up against his bishop, (then absent on account of the persecution,) from motives similar to those which actuated Novatus. The pretext for their conduct was, chiefly, that S. Cyprian, the bishop, was too rigid with those who, having relapsed during the persecution, sought to be admitted to penance.

In 251, Novatus, having forsaken the communion of Cyprian, and originated a new party, promised absolution, without penance, to all the relapsed who would join him, and went to Rome, where he met with Novatian, another turbulent and ambitious priest, who, disappointed at seeing Cornelius preferred to the see of Rome instead of himself, caused a schism in that Church, contriving, with the help of Novatus, to get himself also consecrated as bishop of Rome, by three bishops fetched from a distant part of Italy; to this he added heresy, teaching, amongst other things, that absolution is not to be given to those who have committed mortal sin after baptism, whatever the nature of their sin may be: he would have them only exhorted to repentance; and asserted that there exists in the Church no power to absolve from mortal sin, nay, even went so far as to hold that no hope of salvation remained for those who had relapsed in time of persecution, even though they had sealed their subsequent repentance by martyrdom. In order to draw over others to his errors, he wrote letters to all the Churches, and circulated falsehoods and calumnies in the name of some confessors at Rome whom he had succeeded in bringing over to his party.

Cornelius, at the same time, was not idle in defence of the truth. He, too, wrote letters to all the bishops; and, in consequence of these exertions, several councils were held upon the subject, and particularly that of which we are at present speaking. S. Cyprian, who had now returned to his post, in order to appease the troubles that had arisen, convoked this council.

First, to remove the doubts of those who had been influenced by the false statements of Novatian and his party, with respect to the conduct and consecration of Cornelius, the council resolved to obtain the testimonial

of those who were present at his consecration, and to send deputies to Rome to inquire into the matter. This precautionary step did not, however, hinder S. Cyprian from at once recognizing the election of Cornelius. Africa, 254.

When the deputies of Novatian arrived at Carthage, they required that the bishops should examine their accusations against Cornelius; to which the fathers in council answered, that they would not suffer the reputation of their brother to be attacked, after he had been elected by so many votes, and consecrated; and that a bishop having been once recognized by his fellow-bishops, it was a sin to consecrate another to the same see; and further, the council addressed a synodal letter to Cornelius upon the subject.

Then they proceeded to inquire into the case of Felicissimus, and the five priests who had followed him: these men they condemned and excommunicated. And further, seeing that the two sects, viz. that of Felicissimus and Novatus on the one hand, and of Novatian on the other, virtually destroyed penance by the opposite extremes to which they endeavoured to bring it; the former abolishing it in fact, by admitting at once to communion all those who had fallen into sin, whilst the others altogether refused to acknowledge its efficacy; they proceeded to consider the case of the relapsed. It was decreed that the Libellatici[2], who, immediately after the commission of their fault, began a course of penance, should be thenceforward admitted to communion: that those who had actually sacrificed should be treated more severely, yet so as not to take from them the hope of forgiveness; that they should be for a long period kept to a course of penance, in order that they might thus seek with tears and repentance to obtain God's pardon for their sin. It was further decreed that the different circumstances of the sin of each individual ought to be enquired into, in order that the duration of their course of penitence might be regulated accordingly, that those who had for a long time resisted the violence of the torture should be treated with more lenity; and they judged that three years of penitence ought to suffice in order to render these admissible to communion.

[2] *Libellatici*, so called because they received from the magistrates, for a sum of money, an *attestation* (libellus) of their having sacrificed.

At this council several articles or canons were drawn up, and afterwards forwarded in writing to every bishop. Baronius thinks that these were the same with those afterwards styled the "Penitential Canons."

With respect to bishops and others of the clergy who had either sacrificed or had received certificates of having done so, it was determined that they might be admitted to penance; but that they should be for ever excluded from the priesthood, and from all exercise of their office, or of any ecclesiastical function. It was also determined that the communion ought to be administered to persons who might be visited with mortal sickness during the course of their term of penance.

Novatus and Felicissimus were both condemned in this council, which continued sitting for a long time.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 714.

Africa, 348. AFRICA. Held in the year 348, under Gratus, bishop of Carthage. Fourteen canons relating to discipline were here drawn up.—See C. CARTHAGE, A.D. 348.

Africa, 393. AFRICA (or HIPPO). [*Concilium Hipponense.*] A general council held at Hippo on the 8th Oct. 393; Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, presided; and Megatos, primate of Numidia, and all the other primates of the provinces of Africa were present. Cecilianus and Theodorus spoke in the name of the other bishops. We may perceive from this council how highly S. Augustin was already esteemed, although at the time only in priest's orders. At the request of the bishops assembled, he made a discourse before them upon the subject of faith, and upon the Creed; particularly combating the errors of the Manichæans, of which he had himself been a follower. One fragment alone remains of the acts of this council: it was ruled, that the bishop of Carthage should every year give notice to the primate of each province, of the day on which Easter was to be celebrated in the year following, in order that the latter might inform his suffragans. It was also ordered, that a general African council should be held annually, either at Carthage or in some one of the provinces; which practice continued until the year 407. In this council forty-one canons were agreed to, which were taken as the model for after-councils.—*Cod. Afric.* Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1149.

Africa, 397. AFRICA. Held at Carthage on the 28th of August, 397, called the third council of Carthage. The bishop

Aurelius presided, at the head of forty-four bishops.—See C. Carthage, A.D. 397.

AFRICA. Held on the 13th Sept. 401, to consult upon the best method of acting towards the Donatists. It was resolved to treat them with lenity, and to bring them, as far as possible, to a sense of their miserable condition, in the hope that God might be pleased to open their eyes. And further, it was agreed that those of the Donatist clergy who desired to resume their ministerial functions in the Church, should be received. Afterwards the council drew up certain rules of discipline [3]: Africa, 401.

1st. The canon made in the council of Carthage, A.D. 390, which forbids the marriage of bishops, priests, and deacons, was confirmed, and its observance enforced under pain of deposition. In the case of other ecclesiastics, it was ruled that each Church should follow its own custom in the matter.

2ndly. It was forbidden to any bishop to change the place of his see, or to absent himself from it for long together.

3rdly. It was ordered, that whenever it became necessary to convoke a general council, all the bishops of each province should assemble previously, in two or three classes, from each of which deputies should be chosen, who should be obliged to proceed forthwith to the council, or to communicate the cause of their absence.

4thly. That such of the clergy as should be refused communion and deposed, on account of any crime committed, should be allowed the space of one year wherein to justify themselves; which not being done within the year, they should never be received again.

5thly. That if any bishop should make any strangers, not his relatives, or even his relatives, if they were heretics or heathens, his heirs, in preference to the Church, he should be anathematized after his death. This is to be understood of that property only which the eighth canon of the council of Hippo permitted them to dispose of by will; viz. his patrimony and property which had been given to him.

6thly. In order to prevent superstition, it was resolved to allow of no altar or chapel in honour of a

[3] Some suppose that these canons were drawn up at another council in the same year. See C. Carthage, A. D. 401.

martyr, except his body was actually there buried, or except he had lived or had suffered there; and that all altars should be destroyed which had been erected upon the strength of pretended revelations.

It is not known what bishops were present in this council, but there is good reason to believe that the number was large, and that Alypius, S. Augustin, and S. Euodius, were of the number.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1242.

Africa, 402. AFRICA (or MILEVI). [*Concilium Milevitanum.*] Held at Milevi, in Numidia, in 402. At this council Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, was present. The canons of Hippo and of Carthage having been read over, the bishops confirmed and subscribed them. And in order to remove any difficulties which might arise about the order of promotion, it was ruled that all those who should afterwards be made bishops, should receive a letter written or signed by the officiating prelates, specifying the day and consulate when the consecration took place. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1323.

Africa, 403. AFRICA. Held at Carthage on the 25th August, 403; at which Alypius, S. Augustin, and Possidius, were present; what other bishops were there, is unknown. At this council the Donatists were invited to a conference, but they rejected the offer with contempt, pretending that they could not enter upon a conference with sinners: in consequence, the fathers in council were obliged, through their legates, the bishops Euodius and Theasius, to require from the emperor Honorius that laws should be enacted against the Donatists.—*Codex Can. Afric.* p. 1104 B. to 1108 B. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1331.

Africa, 405. AFRICA. Held at Carthage on the 23rd August, 405. It was resolved that letters should be written to the governors of the provinces, begging them to labour to effect union throughout Africa: also a letter to the emperor was agreed upon, thanking him for the expulsion of the Donatists.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1333.

Africa, 407. AFRICA. Held at Carthage in 407. At this council deputies were present from every province in Africa. By common consent it was agreed to annul the canon of Hippo, which decreed that a general African council should be held annually, because the difficulty of getting to the council was too much for the bishops. It was further ruled, that when any circumstance arose affecting the whole Church of Africa,

the matter should be communicated in writing to the bishop of Carthage, who should thereupon convoke a council, in which it might be determined what should be done: that other matters should be considered and determined in their own province. That in case of an appeal, each party should name their own judges, from whose decision there should be no further appeal. In order to prevent the bishops from going to the emperor's court more than was absolutely necessary, the council ordered that the cause should be specified in the letter to the Roman Church, given to every bishop journeying to Rome, and that when at Rome, a letter for the court should be given to him. That if any bishop, having received a commendatory letter for his voyage to Rome, without saying that he intended to go to the court, should nevertheless go thither, he should be separated from communion. It was also ruled, that no new see should be erected without the consent of the bishop out of whose diocese it was to be formed, and that of the primate and whole council of the province. Rules were also laid down concerning the converted Donatists; the council further deputed the bishops Vincentius and Fortunatianus to attend the emperor in the name of the whole African Church, and to defend the cause of the Church in the conference with the Donatists, and also to demand of the emperor five advocates to defend the interests of the Church.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1333.

AFRICA. Held at Carthage on the 1st May, 418; composed of two hundred and seventeen or two hundred and fourteen bishops. Here nine doctrinal articles, drawn up by St. Augustin, were agreed to against the Pelagians. These nine articles or canons have come down to our time, and are dated May 1, 418. The three last definitively declare that no man can be said to be without sin, and anathematize those who should deny it. Besides these eight canons, the oldest Roman code adds another, by which the council condemns with anathema those who hold that infants dying without baptism enjoy a happy existence, without the kingdom of heaven. Photius, who, as Tillemont observes, we must believe to have had the use of good MSS., recognises this canon; and, as a further proof of its genuineness, S. Augustin in his letter to Bonifacius says, that both councils and popes have condemned the heresy of

Africa, 418.

Africa, 418. the Pelagians, who maintain that infants not baptized enjoy a place of salvation and repose out of heaven.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576. *Phot. Bibl.* c. 53. p. 41. *Aug. ad Bon.* l. 2. c. 12. p. 492. 1. d.

In this same council ten other canons were agreed to against the Donatists. It was determined, that in places containing both Catholics and Donatists, each party recognising a different diocesan, the Donatists, at whatever period they might have been converted, should belong to the bishopric which the original Catholics of the place recognised. That if a Donatist bishop should be converted, those parishes where the Donatists had been under his jurisdiction, and the Catholics under the bishop of some other city, should be equally divided between the two bishops, the oldest to make the division, and the other to have the choice. The same council determined by another remarkable canon, that if the priests and other inferior clergy had any complaint to make against the judgment of their bishop, their case might be judged by the neighbouring bishops, from whose decision they might appeal either to the primate or to the council of Africa; but if they pretended to appeal to any authority beyond the sea, all persons in Africa were forbidden to communicate with them. It also gave permission to a virgin to take the veil and the vows before the age of twenty-five, in cases where her chastity was endangered by the power of those who sought her in marriage, provided also that those upon whom she was dependent made the demand as well as herself.

Since the bishops at this council waited to see what steps pope Zosimus would take in the matter of the Pelagians, the chief of them continued at Carthage, and thus formed there for some time a sort of general council. In the end, Zosimus, perceiving that he had permitted himself to be taken in[4] by the Pelagians, gave his sentence, confirming the decrees of the African council; and in accordance with the judgment of pope Innocentius, his predecessor, he condemned afresh Pelagius and Celestius, reduced them to the rank of penitents, upon condition that they abjured their errors,

[4] Pelagius, and Celestius his disciple, by means of a false confession of faith, deluded pope Zosimus into giving them a commendatory letter to the bishops of Africa. For the heretical opinions of Pelagius, see the C. of Diospolis.

and in case of refusal, sentenced them to be entirely cut off from the communion of the Church. He also wrote a very long epistle to all the Churches of the world, which all the Catholic bishops subscribed. The emperor Honorius made a decree against the Pelagians, and added the weight of his authority to the decision of the Church.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576.

AFRICA (or CARTHAGE). Held at Carthage, 15th May, 419, in the Basilica of Faustus; convoked by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, assisted by the primate of Numidia, and Faustinus, the legate of the pope. Deputies from the different provinces of Africa, viz. from Numidia, Byzacena, Mauritania, Cæsariensis, and Mauritania Tingitana, from Tripoli, &c., and the bishops of the proconsular province were present, making in all two hundred and seventeen bishops; Aurelius presiding. S. Augustin was present. Africa, 419.

At the first sitting, the pope's instructions to his legates were read, and also the canon, which he brought forward in order to shew that all bishops have a right of appeal to the pope. S. Alypius represented, that as this canon did not appear in the Greek copies of the acts of the council of Nicea, which they possessed, which Cœcilianus had brought to Carthage, it was necessary that Aurelius should send to Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, where the genuine canons were kept, to procure an authentic copy of them. It was, however, agreed, that in order not to give offence to the pope's legate, they should content themselves with writing upon the subject to Zosimus. Secondly, all that related to the case of appeals was read, and S. Augustin promised that it should be observed, until they had received more authentic copies of the council of Nicea. Thirdly, the Nicene Creed was read, together with the twenty ordinary canons, and the several regulations made by the African councils held under Aurelius. Fourthly, the affair of Apiarius was discussed; this man was a priest of Sicca, in the province of Mauritania; having been guilty of most immoral conduct, he had been deposed and excommunicated by his bishop, Urban, from whose judgment he appealed to the pope, although that step was forbidden by several African councils, and although the council of Nicea had determined that the affairs of the clergy should be settled in their own province without any external

appeal. Nevertheless, Zosimus, according to Baronius, received the appeal of Apiarius, and re-admitted him to communion. The African bishops refused to admit this pretension of the pope with regard to the right of appeal to Rome, and great contentions arose upon the subject, which, no doubt, gave birth to a council, but we have no record of the matter.

Since, therefore, the African bishops had complained that Zosimus had violated ecclesiastical discipline by receiving the appeal of Apiarius, they were not a little surprised to hear the legate Faustinus justify the act of Zosimus, upon the authority of the canons of the council of Nicea. They maintained, that the canons cited under the name of *Nicene*, in order to justify the pretension of Zosimus, were not to be found in any copy, either Greek or Latin, but that they were, in fact, made in the council of Sardica, A. D. 347.

The bishops further desired, that the clergy should make complaint of judgments passed upon them to the primate or council of the province, and not to the bishops of the neighbouring provinces. Finally, S. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and Atticus of Constantinople, delivered to the priests deputed by the council of Carthage, faithful copies of the acts of the council of Nicea, made from the originals preserved amongst the archives of their Churches.

In the second sitting, six canons were drawn up, relating to the charges that might be alleged against clerks.—Tom. ii. Concil. p .1589. *Bar.* 419, § 60.

Africa, 424. AFRICA. Held in the year 424 [5], upon the business of Apiarius, mentioned in the account of the preceding council. After having been re-established by the foregoing council, he was again guilty of great enormities, and, accordingly, a second time excommunicated, and driven out of Trabuca, a city in the proconsulate of Africa, whence he fled to Rome. The pope Celestinus giving credit to every thing that he was pleased to pretend in the way of justification, re-admitted him to communion, and added further, a letter to the bishops of Africa. This conduct on the part of the pope caused the whole of the African bishops to assemble at Carthage, and to hold there a general council. Out of the

[5] It is doubtful whether this was not merely a continuation of the preceding, and held about the same time.

whole number present, the names of fifteen only have come down to us. Amongst them are those of Aurelius of Carthage, Servus-Dei, who was a confessor, Fortunatianus, &c. Africa, 424.

Apiarius appeared at the council with Faustinus, who came thither rather in the character of his advocate than his judge; he even wished to exact from them a promise that they would receive Apiarius into communion with them. The fathers in council, however, judged that they ought, in the first place, to examine into his criminal conduct, in which he tried to justify himself by his usual artifices; but the Almighty so ordered it, that Apiarius, unable to endure the tortures of his conscience, confessed, almost in spite of himself, the crimes of which he had been guilty. Faustinus gave way to this evidence of the truth; and Apiarius was cut off from the body of the Church.

As the fathers in council had now received an answer from the east, and had been thus certified that the canons cited by Zosimus were not in truth amongst those enacted by the council of Nicea, they wrote to pope Celestinus a letter[6], in which, after having complained of his conduct in absolving Apiarius, they begged of him in future not to listen so easily to those who came to him from Africa, and not to receive into communion those whom they had excommunicated, since, by doing so, he violated the canons of Nicea, which direct that cases of this kind shall be settled in the province in which they arise, so that they could not be carried elsewhere without the especial decision of the Church; they added, that the aid and illumination of the Holy Spirit might as reasonably be hoped for several bishops assembled freely in each province, as for one in particular; that to judge of affairs in the place where they have arisen, and where information and witnesses are at hand, is more natural than to remove them beyond sea. Lastly, they begged of the pope to send no more legates to execute his judgments, lest, said they, the pride of the world be introduced into the Church of Christ, which ought to hold forth the light of simplicity and the brightness of humility to all who seek God.

The Church of Africa kept possession of the right of judging her priests, definitively and without appeal, till

[6] See Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1674.

the time of Gregory the Great.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1638.

Africa. 525. AFRICA (or CARTHAGE). Held in 525, at Carthage, under the primate Bonifacius, in order to restore the discipline of the Church. On this occasion an abridgment of the canons made under Aurelius was read. The last three forbid all appeals beyond the sea absolutely, without making any distinction between bishops and others.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1628.

Africa, 535. AFRICA. Held in 535; composed of two hundred and seventeen bishops; convoked to Carthage by Reparatus, bishop of that city. A demand was made of the emperor Justinian to restore the rights and property of the Church, which had been usurped by the Vandals, which request was granted, by a law bearing date the 1st of August in the same year.—Tom. iv. Concil. p. 1784.

Africa, 645. AFRICA. In the year 645, a conference was held between Pyrrhus, bishop of Constantinople, the chief of the Monothelites, and the abbot, S. Maximus, in the presence of the patrician Gregory, and several bishops. Maximus there showed that there were two wills (duæ voluntates) and two operations in Jesus Christ. Pyrrhus yielded to his proofs, and went afterwards to Rome, where he retracted what he had formerly taught, and was received into communion; subsequently, however, he returned to his errors.

Africa, 646. AFRICA. Held in the year 646. Several councils were held in Africa during this year, against the Monothelites: one in Numidia, another in Byzacena, a third in Mauritania, and a fourth at Carthage, (sixty-eight bishops present,) in the proconsular province.

Agaune, 523. AGAUNE (or S. MAURICE EN VALAIS). [*Concilium Agaunense.*] Held on the 14th May, 523; nine bishops were present. The continual psalmody established in this monastery was here confirmed by Sigismond, king of Burgundy.

Agde, 506. AGDE. [*Concilium Agathense.*] Held on the 11th September, 506. Twenty-four bishops were present, and ten deputies of absent bishops, from different provinces of Gaul, which at this time was under the dominion of the Visigoths. Cesarius, bishop of Arles, presided. In this council the discipline of the Church was treated of, and forty-seven canons[7] were drawn up,

[7] Gratianus and others add to these twenty-four canons, which do not appear in the ancient copies of the acts.

confirming the discipline already established in many other councils.

Of these, the 12th enjoins fasting every day in Lent, Sundays excepted

The 16th forbids the making any person deacon under the age of twenty-five years; and if married, without the consent of his wife, and a promise of continence.

The 17th forbids the ordination of bishops or priests under thirty years of age.

The 18th orders all lay persons to communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide.

The 19th forbids any woman to take the veil under forty years of age, however holy and exemplary her previous life had been.

The 20th forbids the clergy to wear long hair, and orders the archdeacon to cause that of the disobedient to be cut.

The 27th forbids the establishment of any monastery without the consent of the bishop; also forbids the bishop to ordain any monk without the consent of his abbot first had.

The 31st orders that those persons who, having been at variance for a long time, shall refuse to be reconciled, shall be excommunicated.

The 34th orders that converted Jews shall remain eight months in the rank of catechumens before they are baptized.

The 39th forbids persons in holy orders to attend wedding festivities.

The 44th forbids a priest to bless the people or a penitent in Church.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1381.

Agnani, 1160.

AGNANI. [*Concilium Agnanium.*] Held on the 24th March, 1160. Pope Alexander III., assisted by certain bishops and cardinals, in this council solemnly excommunicated the emperor Frederic, and absolved all his subjects from their oath of fidelity to him. However, as M. Fleury remarks, it does not seem that Frederic was at all the less obeyed or the less recognized as emperor *after* this excommunication than he was *before*.

Aix-la-Chapelle, 800.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. [*Concilium Aquisgranense.*] Held in 800. At this council Felix d'Urgel was heard in his defence before Charlemagne. He was answered and refuted by Alcuin, originally deacon of the Church

of York, and abbot of the monastery of Canterbury, whom Charles had induced to come over to France. On account of his frequent relapses, Felix was deposed, but he returned into the bosom of the Church, having sincerely abjured his errors, which he did in the form of a letter addressed to the clergy and people of Urgel; he was nevertheless banished to Lyons, where he passed the remainder of his days. See C. Ratisbon, 792; C. Rome, 792, and C. Urgel, 799.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1151.

Aix-la-Chapelle, 802. AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in the month of October, in the year 802, by order of Charlemagne; it was a numerous council. The bishops with the priests read the canons, and the abbots with the monks, the rule of S. Benedict, in order that both parties might thenceforth live in conformity to the law which was prescribed for them. At that time there were no monks or religious persons who followed any other rule than that of S. Benedict. There remains to us of this council a capitular of seven articles: the most important are those which relate to the chorepiscopi; it was determined that they had no power to perform any episcopal function, and should be considered simply as priests. This discipline agrees with that of the ancient councils of Anagra and Neocesarea; nevertheless, it was not until towards the middle of the tenth century that they ceased to have authority in both the east and the west.—*Fleury.*

Aix-la-Chapelle, 809. AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in December, 809, upon the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which had been first raised by John, a monk of Jerusalem. In order to decide it, the emperor sent as deputies to pope Leo III. two bishops, Bernarius and Jesse, and the abbot Adelhard, who held a long conference upon the use of the words "*Filioque*," chanted in the creed by the Churches of France and Spain, but not by the Church of Rome. The pope expressed his regret that the same caution had not been used elsewhere; and without *condemning* those who in chanting the creed added the words "*Filioque*," and allowing that the words expressed the true faith, he refused to sanction the introduction of the words into the creed, respecting the decision of those councils which had forbidden any addition to be made.—*Fleury.* See C. Toledo, A.D. 589. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1194.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in September, 816. In it a rule was composed for canons, containing one hundred and forty-five articles; another was also drawn up for *canonesses*, which contained twenty-eight articles. Both rules are of great length, and are said to have been mainly composed by Amalry, deacon of Metz.—*Fleury*, tom. vii. Conc. p. 1307. Aix-la-Chapelle, 816.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in July, 817. Here eighty chapters were drawn up concerning the rule of S. Benedict, which the emperor Louis confirmed, and by his authority put into execution.—*Fleury*, tom. vii. Conc. p. 1505. Aix-la-Chapelle, 817.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in the year 825. This council, held upon the subject of images, was a continuation of one held at Paris in the same year. The bishops wrote on the 6th of December a letter to the emperor at Aix-la-Chapelle, containing their decision, the whole matter was then sent to the pope by the hands of two bishops. What was the result of the negociation between the pope and the bishops is not known; the French, however, certainly maintained, for some time after, that images are neither to be broken nor adored, rejecting the second council of Nicea, although the pope had approved it.—*Fleury*. See C. Paris, A.D. 825. Aix-la-Chapelle, 825.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held on the 6th of February, 836. The acts of this council are divided into three parts: Aix-la-Chapelle, 836.

Part I. refers to the life and doctrine of bishops, and contains twelve canons, the third of which makes it imperative upon all bishops to have some poor persons always at their table when they eat [or to have them, at least, somewhere within sight, and to send them food].

Part II. relates to the morals, and conversation, and degree of knowledge to be required in other ecclesiastics, and contains twenty-eight canons.

Part III. treats of the virtues and duties required from the emperor and his children, principally in those matters which affect ecclesiastical affairs. This part contains twenty-five canons.

A very long address was also drawn up to Pepin, king of Aquitaine, requiring him to restore the property of the Church.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1700.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. Held in 1165. This was a plenary court of the emperor Frederic, assembled for Aix-la-Chapelle, 1165.

the canonization of Charlemagne, which was performed on the 29th December. Although this canonization was the act of schismatics, and had the sanction only of an antipope, no pope has ever refused to recognize it.—*Fleury.*

Aix, in Provence, 1585.

AIX. [*Consilium Aquense.*] Held in September, 1585, by Alexander Canigianus, archbishop of Aix, assisted by the bishops of Apt, Gap, Riez, and Sisteron, his suffragans, together with the grand vicar of the bishop of Frejus. Several useful regulations were drawn up relating to the discipline of the Church and the reformation of morals, similar to those of Bourges in the preceding year.—Conc. tom. xv. p. 1119.

Albi, 1254.

ALBI. [*Concilium Albiense.*] Held in 1254 by order of S. Louis, who had lately returned from the Holy Land; bishops from the provinces of Narbonne, Bourges, and Bourdeaux attended, Zoen, bishop of Avignon, presiding. Seventy-one canons were published; part of them relate to the extirpation of heresy, and part to the reformation of the clergy, &c. The first twenty-eight are taken from the canons of Toulouse, A.D. 1229.

1. Orders that persons be duly appointed to search after heretics.

2. Grants a silver mark to every one taking a heretic.

5. Deprives of their land persons who allow heretics to harbour there.

6. Orders the destruction of the houses of heretics.

11, 12. Enact that all persons arrived at the age of puberty shall abjure heresy, and take an oath of fidelity to the Roman Church.

18. Orders that all boys above seven years of age shall be brought to Church by their parents, to be instructed by the curate in the Catholic faith, and to be taught the *Credo*, *Pater Noster*, and Salutation of the Blessed Virgin.

21—23. Relate to the papers, &c. of the Inquisition.

24. Orders the construction of prisons for the condemned heretics, where they shall be detained and supported (as the bishop shall direct) out of their confiscated property.

25. Orders that the bones of those who have died in heresy and have been buried, shall be taken up and publicly burnt.

29. Renews the canon "Omnes utriusque sexus."

31—36. Relate to excommunications.

37. Orders that every will shall be made in the presence of a priest.

41. Forbids to harbour any suspicious woman within the precincts of the Church.

42. Orders silver chalices to be used in all churches of which the revenues amount to 15 *livres tournois*.

46. Forbids regulars to have any of their horse harness, &c. of silver or gold; orders them to use saddles of white or black, or polished saddles (*rasæ*).

48. Forbids clerks to gamble; orders them to have their hair so cut all round as to leave the ears altogether uncovered.

50, 51. Forbid them to hunt and hawk and tilt, in game, with shield and lance.

55. Orders two regular canons, at least, in every prison.

56. Orders all collators to benefices to present to persons without previous agreement or diminution of revenue.

57—60. Of the visitations of bishops.

62, 63. Of usurers and Jews.

64, 65. Orders that Jews shall have a distinctive dress, and shall constantly wear a large wheel figured on their breast.

66—70. Of Jews.—Conc. tom. xi. p. 720.

ALCALA DE HENARES. [*Concilium Complutense.*] Held in 1326 by Juan of Arragon, archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain; three bishops and three deputies were present. Two canons only were published: Alcala de Henarés, 1326.

1. Of the consecration of suffragans.

2. On the defence of the rights and property of the Church.—Conc. tom. xi. p. 1771.

ALEXANDRIA. [*Concilium Alexandrinum.*] Held in 230, under the bishop Demetrius, in which Origen was deposed from the priesthood, but not without opposition. Alexandria, 230.

ALEXANDRIA. Held in 306, under Peter, bishop of Alexandria, the martyr. Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, was deposed here, being convicted of having sacrificed to idols, and of having committed many other crimes. In order to revenge himself, Meletius began a schism which lasted for upwards of fifty years.—*Tillemont.* Alexandria, 306.

Alexandria, 319. ALEXANDRIA. Held in the year 319, by the celebrated Hosius, bishop of Cordova, sent by Constantine [8] to appease the troubles to which the heresies of Arius, and the schism of Meletius, had given rise, and to restore the peace of the Church. Hosius conducted himself in the business with fidelity and care, worthy of his piety and of the confidence placed in him. In this council every thing relating to the doctrine of the Trinity, and to the condemnation of the heresy of Sabellius, who denied the distinction of persons in the sacred Trinity, was thoroughly discussed [9]. Very little, however, is known of what passed here.—*Athan.* ii. 79; *Tillemont; Socrates*, l. iii. c. 5; tom. i. Conc. p. 1493.

Alexandria, 321. ALEXANDRIA. Held in 321, by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, attended by all his clergy, on account of the heresy of Arius, which was there condemned. Arius was the curate of a Church in Alexandria; he was a man of very considerable talent, with all the external appearance of inward excellence. Jealousy at seeing Alexander promoted to the throne of Alexandria, betrayed him into heresy.

The unimpeachable life of his bishop affording him no handle for attacking his character, he determined to accuse him on the score of doctrine; and as Alexander taught, according to the faith of the Church, that our Saviour Jesus Christ is truly God, Arius dared, first in private conversation, and afterwards publicly, to assert that the bishop was in error, and had fallen into the heresy of Sabellius; that our Lord was but a creature, however exalted.

His own views, more fully explained, were briefly as follows:—That God was not always a Father; but there was a time when He was only God, and was not a Father; that afterwards he became a Father. And that the Son was not always such; for since all things

[8] By pope Sylvester, according to Baronius; but there appears to be no foundation for the assertion.—*Cave.*

[9] "Factum est in synodo, ut in Sanctissimâ Trinitate sicut una prædicaretur οὐσία, id est essentia, ita tres dicerentur *subsistentiæ* nempe ὑποστάσεις, sed cum hæc vox apud nonnullos acciperetur pro *substantia*, inde major oborta est controversia num recte dicerentur tres esse in Trinitate substantiæ."

In this council Colluthus, a priest of Alexandria, who had pretended to exercise episcopal functions, and had celebrated a mock ordination, was brought to order and censured.

Probably several councils were held in Egypt about this time.

were made of nothing, and that all things were created and made, the Word of God itself must be made out of nothing, and was not before He was made, but had a beginning when he was made. . . .That the Son hath nothing peculiar of the Father's substance, but that He is a creature, and not true God, but only by participation, and as He is made God. That there is a Trinity, but not all alike in majesty, whose subsistences are unmingled. In short, that God was before the Son, not only in order of *nature*, but of *time;* that the Son, though begotten of Him, has not the same essence, power, and glory with Him, not made of His substance, nor partaking at all of His nature or existing in His essence; but altogether different, both in nature and power, though formed to the perfect likeness of it.

Alexander having sent for Arius, endeavoured to win him back by mildness, advising and exhorting him to open his eyes to the enormity of his error. He even held conferences with his clergy in the presence of Arius; but the latter persisted in his opinions, and maintained with insolence all that he had advanced. At last this council was convoked early in the year 321, in which Arius and nine other of the clergy of Alexandria were condemned and deprived. Also a synodical letter was addressed by Alexander to his brother-bishop Alexander of Byzantium, which Theodoret gives, l. i. c. 4.—*Cave's Apostolici*, p. 349.

ALEXANDRIA. Held later in the same year, by Alexander, composed of one hundred Egyptian bishops, exclusive of the priests who were present. Arius was here questioned concerning his faith, and the heresy of which he was accused. He maintained his error with boldness; and the bishops, having heard his blasphemies from his own mouth, proceeded to anathematize him and twelve of his followers, both priests and deacons; also two bishops, Secundus and Theona; and to pass censure upon Eusebius of Nicomedia. Alexandria, 321.

Arius retired into Palestine, where he had already gathered many followers. The most considerable of his disciples was the above-mentioned Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, the city in which the emperors of the east resided. This Eusebius enjoyed great reputation at the court, and was in high favour with Constantia, the wife of Licinius, and the sister of Constantine. It may indeed be justly said, that amongst all the followers of

Arius, no one has been more celebrated, or has done more mischief to the Church.—*Tillemont; Epiph. Hæres.* 69.

Alexandria, 340. ALEXANDRIA. Held in 340, in support of S. Athanasius, and after the death of Constantine. There were present at it eighty or one hundred bishops, from Egypt, the Thebaid, Lybia, and Pentapolis. All the calumnies advanced against Athanasius by the Eusebians were refuted. Every thing at this council was done according to rule, and altogether in a manner very different to what had been done two or three years before at the council of Tyre. S. Athanasius was fully justified. These same bishops also wrote a synodical letter to all the orthodox prelates, in order that, by union amongst themselves, they might be strengthened against the heresy. Complaint was made that the Eusebians continued to persecute Athanasius; that they had caused him to be exiled; and that they had sent to the three emperors a letter filled with fresh calumnies against him. They justified his conduct; they went back to the origin of the persecutions which Athanasius had suffered, and showed that the Arians had hated him, even when he was only in deacon's orders; they proved that his ordination was strictly according to rule; they observed, that Eusebius of Nicomedia had changed his see several times, forgetting that he who is once bound to a Church by the episcopate may not seek to change, lest he be found guilty of adultery according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. They showed, further, that the proceedings of the council of Tyre were invalid, both because the party of Eusebius was dominant there, and the secular power prevented all freedom of action; again, they exonerated Athanasius of the murder of Arsenius, alluded afresh to the irregularity of the proceedings in the Mareotis, accused the Eusebians of dividing the Church by menaces and terror, and, finally, exhorted the bishops to give no credit to any thing written against Athanasius.—*Athan.* ii. *Apol.* p. 720, *et seq. Fleury.* Tom. ii. Conc. p. 532.

Alexandria, 362. ALEXANDRIA. Held in the year 362, by S. Athanasius, in concert with S. Eusebius of Verceil, to deliberate with him and the other bishops upon the affairs of the Church, and particularly upon the means to be adopted for restoring peace and union to the Church of Antioch, where the "orthodox" Christians,

who for some time had communicated with the Arians, having at last, in 361, separated from them, and united themselves to Meletius, (elected bishop in the council of Antioch, A.D. 360,) could not induce the Eustathians (who were the original Catholics of the city [1]) to unite with them. Alexandria, 362.

Besides S. Athanasius and S. Eusebius, we find S. Asterius, of Petra in Arabia, Paphnucius, of Saïs, and about twenty others. They applied themselves with great industry to discover the most advisable methods for restoring order in the Church, agitated as it had been by such a tempest of heresy. Constantius, the great patron of the Arians, was now dead.

The council settled that those who had been *leaders* or *defenders* of the heresy should be admitted to penance, but that they could not be permitted to retain their clerical office, while those who had been led away by the violence of others should be allowed to retain their rank, provided they subscribed the acts of the council of Nicea.—*Ath. de Ant.* p. 575, c. d. *Bar.* 362, § 235.

In the next place, the affairs of the Church of Antioch were discussed, where the Eustathians refused to submit to Meletius, who had been in communion with the heretics, by whom also he had been consecrated bishop. The bishops in council requested Eusebius and Asterius to proceed to Antioch in the name of the council; and, further, wrote a letter to the three bishops, Luciferus, Cymacius, and Anatolus, in which they expressed their joy that the Meletians were willing to unite with the followers of Paulinus, i. e. with the Eustathians; they

[1] When the Arian bishops had taken possession of the see of Antioch, many, both of the clergy and laity, who purposed to abide in the true faith, forsook the public service of the Church, and assembled by themselves for divine service. Those who did so were called Eustathians, because they began first to assemble in this way after the death of Eustathius. These men from the first had boldly contended for the true faith, and refused to communicate with those who were called the orthodox; i. e. those who held the true faith and acknowledged Meletius for their lawful bishop, because Meletius had been elected by the Arians, and had in some things given way to them. Thus there were three bishops of Antioch at one time—Paulinus, the bishop of the original Catholics or Eustathians, consecrated by Luciferus; Meletius, the bishop of the Orthodox, elected by the Arians, under the belief that he favoured their views; and Euzojus, whom the Arians had subsequently elected.

Alexandria, 362. exhorted them to require nothing further from the Meletians in order to union, than that, 1st, they should acknowledge the acts of the council of Nicea; 2nd, they should anathematize the heresy of Arius, and also that which teaches that the Holy Spirit is a mere creature, and not of the same substance with the Father and the Son. This was a necessary precaution to be taken against the new sect of the Macedonians; against whom it had already been decreed, by this same council, that it is necessary to believe that the Holy Spirit is of the same substance, and equally God with the Father and the Son; and that in the sacred Trinity, no one of the divine persons is either created, or inferior to other, or of later existence than another; lastly, they exhorted them to require that they should anathematize the foolish impieties of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, Valentinian, Basilides, and the Manicheans, and that having so done, the Meletians ought to be received without suspicion, and that the followers of Paulinus should require nothing more. In this council a discussion was also raised upon the use of the term ὑπόστασις, which subject at that time greatly agitated the whole Church; the Latins understanding by the term the actual "*substance*," were accordingly unwilling to allow more than *one* ὑπόστασις in God, and accused those of Arianism who recognized three. The Greeks, on the contrary, using the word in the sense of "*person*," maintained that it was necessary to admit *three*, to avoid the error of Sabellianism. S. Athanasius, therefore, in order to compose these differences, required from each party a definition of what they believed; and finding from their answers that they, in fact, held precisely the same doctrine, in nothing differing from the catholic faith, he permitted to each party the use of the term ὑπόστασις, and bound them to receive the definitions of the Nicene council, without confusing themselves with new questions. However, notwithstanding the pains and judicious conduct of Athanasius, the Church was, for a long time, sorely troubled about the use of this word. Another act of this council was a complete declaration of the doctrine of the Incarnation, in opposition to the heresy of Apollinarius, who already, not openly, but in secret, had begun to teach contrary to this truth. It was defined that Jesus Christ was born of Mary; that He was

"very man," as to the flesh, and that He did not take to Himself a body only without a soul or mind.

The pains, however, which the council, and Athanasius in particular, had taken to procure peace to the Church of Antioch failed, owing to the intemperate behaviour of Luciferus, who had consecrated Paulinus, the chief of the Eustathians; and being offended with Eusebius for finding fault with this act, he rejected the decrees of the council, and withdrew, first from communion with Athanasius, and afterwards from that of the Church: whence arose the schism of the Luciferians, which lasted forty years.—*Cave's Apostolici*, p. 444. Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 97. 808.

ALEXANDRIA. Held in 363, consisting of all the bishops in Egypt, called together by S. Athanasius, in order to fulfil the request of the emperor Jovian, that he would send him an exposition of the true faith. In the synodical answer, Athanasius exhorted the emperor to adhere to the declaration of faith settled at Nicea. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 823. Alexandria, 363.

ALEXANDRIA. Held in the year 401. In this council the writings of Origen were condemned, as they had already been in the West. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, who there presided, condemned also the four great brothers. Many other councils were held this year in the East against the writings of Origen. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1219. Alexandria, 401.

ALEXANDRIA. Convoked by S. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, in the month of November, 430, to communicate a letter received by him from the pope Celestine, and another, which the same pope had written to Nestorius. Alexandria, 430.

The council determined that another letter should be written to Nestorius, warning him, both in the name of this council and of that of Rome, to correct his errors and embrace the Catholic faith; and to signify to him, that, if he refused, they should no longer hold communion with him, or recognize him as bishop. This letter is divided into three parts: one containing an exposition of the faith, beginning with the Nicene creed; then follow the twelve celebrated anathemas of Cyril; and, lastly, the announcement of the sentence passed against Nestorius by Celestine, in August, A. D. 430.

These anathemas referred to the twelve principal

heads of the Nestorian heresy.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 395; *Conc. Eph.* c. 26.

Altino, 802. ALTINO. [*Concilium Altinense.*] Held 802; where Paulinus of Aquilea implored the help of Charlemagne against John, duke of Venice, who had thrown down from the top of a tower John, patriarch of Grade.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1187.

Anazarba, 435. ANAZARBA. [*Concilium Anazarbicum.*] Held in 435. In this council many bishops, following the example of Theodoret, put themselves in communion with John of Antioch.

Ancyra, the metropolis of Galatia, 314. ANCYRA. [*Concilium Ancyranum.*] Held about Easter, 314. Eighteen bishops only were present, amongst whom were Vitalis of Antioch, and Marcellus of Ancyra, well known in the history of S. Athanasius, Lupus of Tarsus, and Amphion of Epiphania.

Twenty-four canons were drawn up, chiefly relating to the case of those who had relapsed during the persecution of Maximinus.

1. Orders that priests who, after their fall, have sincerely repented, shall be permitted to retain their rank, but excluded from all exercise of their office.

2. Orders the same concerning deacons.

3. Orders that those who have been forcibly made to sacrifice, shall be admitted to communion; and that laymen should not, by such violence, be incapacitated from receiving holy orders.

6. Orders that those who have been induced to sacrifice by threats, &c., shall, upon repentance, be received as hearers from the time of holding this synod to the great day (Easter): after this, as prostrators for three years, and for two years more as communicants without offering. In case of sickness and danger, they might be received under limitation.

8. Orders that those who have sacrificed two or three times, even under violence, shall fulfil a penance of six years.

9. Enjoins a penance of ten years upon those who have led away their brethren.

10. Allows those persons who, at the time of their being made deacons, declared their intention to marry, to do so, and to remain in the ministry; those who did not so declare their purpose, but were ordained professing continence, to be deposed if they afterwards marry.

12. Allows the ordination of those who sacrificed before baptism.

13. Forbids the chorepiscopi to ordain priests or deacons without the permission of the bishop in writing.

14. Deprives those of the clergy who obstinately, through superstition, refuse to touch meat, and vegetables cooked with meat.

15. Enacts that Church property unlawfully sold by priests during a vacancy in the bishopric, shall be reclaimed.

18. Excommunicates those who, having been appointed bishops, and refused by the person in the parish to which they have been appointed, wish to invade other parishes[2].

20. Enjoins seven years penance for adultery.

24. Enjoins five years of penance to those who use soothsaying, and follow the customs of the Gentiles. —Tom. i. Conc. pp. 1456. 1480.

Ancyra, 358. Pseudo-Council.

ANCYRA. Held in 358, by certain semi-Arian bishops, headed by Basil of Ancyra, and George of Laodicea. They condemned the grosser blasphemies of the Arians. The pure Arians taught that the Son of God is but a mere creature, but the semi-Arians believed Him to be more than a created being, and even *like* to the Father, but not of the same substance with Him, nor equal to Him. The Eusebians favoured this latter notion, and drew up a long exposition of the faith, which they presented to the bishops: in which by establishing that the Son is of *like* substance with the Father, they cunningly implied that He is not of the *same* substance with Him; and anathematized the term *consubstantial*. The semi-Arians sent a deputation to Constantius, and obtained the suppression of the second confession or formulary of Sirmium, made in 357.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 789. *Sozomen*, l. iv. c. 13. *Epiph. Hær.* lxxii.

Angers, 453.

ANGERS. [*Concilium Andegavense.*] Held in 453, in order to consecrate a bishop to the see of Angers; Leo, archbishop of Bourges, presided. The council, before separating, made twelve canons for the better maintenance of discipline. The first is to the effect, that since the emperor had granted to the bishops the power of trying civil causes, the clergy should, in every

[2] The original meaning of this word is equivalent to that of the modern word "diocese."

case of difference amongst themselves, apply to them instead of to the lay authorities; and that in case of dispute arising between any of the clergy and the laity, they should still require to be judged by their bishop; but if the other contending party would not agree to this, then they should first obtain permission of their diocesan to go before the secular judge. Further, the clergy were forbidden to occupy themselves with any secular business. Wandering monks were to be excommunicated. Assaults and mutilation were forbidden, showing what disorders were caused by the incursions of the barbarians who then ravaged Gaul. The fourth canon also deprives those of the clergy who would not abstain from intercourse with all "*strange*" women, i. e. all who were not near relations.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1020.

Angers, 1055. ANGERS. Held about the year 1055, against Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, born at Tours in the beginning of the eleventh century. Having studied in the school of S. Martin, and subsequently at Chartres, under the famous Fulbert (afterwards bishop of Chartres), he was chosen to teach in the public school of S. Martin at Tours; here it was that he first maintained that the body and blood of our Lord are not really present in the Eucharist, but only in a figure. He was condemned in twelve councils, of which this was one. He is said, also, to have maintained that the baptism of children is null and void, and that marriage is inexpedient, and promiscuous concubinage lawful.

Angers, 1279. ANGERS. Held on the 22nd October, 1279, by John de Monsoreau, archbishop of Tours. Five canons were made, one of which punished excommunicated clergy with the loss of the profits of their benefices as long as the period of excommunication lasted. This shows that the clergy themselves, by their own example, led the people to make light of the sentence of excommunication, and that it was no longer regarded as the extreme canonical punishment; also the second canon forbids the bishop's officials to require any fee for sealing letters of orders, under pain of suspension or excommunication.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1074.

Angers, 1365. ANGERS. Held on the 12th of March, 1365, by Simon Renoul, archbishop of Tours, and seven of his suffragans. Thirty-four articles were drawn up, the first of which relate to proceedings at law, other articles

relate to the immunities of the Church, and a few tend directly to the correction of morals.—*Fleury*. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1939.

ANGERS. A provincial council of Touraine was held at Angers in July, 1448, by John, archbishop of Tours, with his suffragans. Seventeen regulations were made for the reformation of abuses. The third orders all priests to say the office for the dead, with three lessons at least, every day that was not an holy-day. The fourth forbids the giving the daily distribution to those of the clergy who were not present at the holy office. The fifth forbids all talking in the choir. Angers, 1448.

The council also orders in canon seven, that the Word of God should be preached only in Churches and with becoming dignity; and forbids the preacher to make use of loud cries or extravagant gestures: it also forbids clandestine marriages, and the silly tumult and noise made in derision when any one marries a second or third time, commonly called "*charivari*."—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1352.

ANGERS. Held in 1583, being a continuation of one held at Tours in the same year, which, on account of the plague, which had broken out in that city, was transferred to Angers. Several regulations were made: First, upon the subject of holy baptism, directions were given as to the choice of god-parents; it was also forbidden to re-baptize, even conditionally, in cases where that sacrament had been administered by heretics, provided the matter and form of words and intention had been preserved. Secondly, confirmation, the holy eucharist, the sacrifice of the mass, marriage, orders, the celebration of the festivals, and the worship of relics were treated of. Thirdly, the subjects of reform, ecclesiastical discipline, the duty of bishops, canons, curates, &c., were discussed; amongst other regulations, the monks were ordered to preserve the tonsure large and distinct, and to shave their beards. Fourthly, a rigid abstinence from meat every Wednesday and during all Advent was enjoined them. With respect to nuns, it was forbidden to appoint any one to be abbess or prioress under forty years of age, and eight of profession. Angers, 1583.

Matters concerning the burial of the dead, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, visitations, the preservation of ecclesiastical property, seminaries, schools, and universi-

ties, were also discussed in this council, and the regulations agreed upon were confirmed by a bull of Gregory XIII. of the same year, and published by order of the king, Henry III.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1001.

Anse, 1025. ANSE. [*Concilium Ansense.*] Held in 1025, at Anse, near Lyons. Gaustin de Maçon complained against Bouchard, archbishop of Vienne, for having ordained certain monks of Clugny, although that monastery was in the diocese of Maçon. Odilon, the abbot, exhibited the pope's privilege, which exempted the monks of Clugny from the jurisdiction of their own bishop, and gave permission, that they might be ordained by any bishop whom the abbot chose. However, the council having caused the canons to be read, which order that in every country all abbeys and monasteries shall be subject to their proper bishop, declared the privilege to be null and void, being plainly contrary to those canons[3].—*Fleury.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 859.

Anse, 1100. ANSE. Held in 1100. Five archbishops, of whom Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, was one, and nine bishops, were present. Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, demanded a subsidy to defray the expenses of a voyage which he was obliged to make to Jerusalem.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 726.

Antioch, 252. ANTIOCH. [*Concilium Antiochenum.*] Held in 252. Fabius, the bishop of Antioch, being strongly inclined towards the errors of Novatian, the pope, Cornelius, addressed to him a letter, strongly setting forth the heretical nature of his opinions, which had the good effect of turning many from their evil course in that country, and bringing them back into the bosom of the Church. Added to this, the bishops of the neighbouring country seeing Antioch to be in a miserable state of schism, and suffering greatly through the prevalence of these heresies, convoked this council, to which bishops came from Cappadocia, Syria, Asia, and Egypt. The acts of the council are lost, but Dionysius of Alexandria, as Eusebius says, laboured much against the Novatians. —Tom. i. Conc. p. 719.

Antioch, 264 and 269. ANTIOCH. Held in 264, against the errors of Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, whose life was,

[3] C. Orleans, A.D. 511, Can. 19. C. Epaune, A.D. 517, Can. 19. Arles, A.D. 554, Can. 2.

in other respects, little suited to the sanctity of his office; his evil course of life caused him to lose sight of the truth. He taught, as Sabellius had done in 255, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit were but One Person; that the Word and the Spirit were in the Father without a real and personal existence, and merely as reason is in man; so that, in fact, there was neither Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit, but simply One God. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that the Father produced the Word, but only in order that He might operate out of Himself; in which he differed from Sabellius. His error upon the subject of the Incarnation was equally fatal; he would not allow that the Son of God came down from heaven, he maintained that Jesus Christ was of the earth, a mere man, having, by nature, nothing above other men; he confessed that the Word, Wisdom, and Eternal Light were in Him, but only as dwelling in Him, not by a personal union. Antioch, 264 and 269.

Hence he recognised in Jesus Christ two ὑποστάσεις, two Persons, two Christs, and two Sons, one of whom was the Son of God by nature, and co-eternal with the Father, being no other, according to his showing, than the Father Himself; whilst the other, who was the Son of David and the Son of the Virgin Mary, was Christ only in an improper sense, having had no existence before his birth of the Virgin, and being called the Son of God only because He was the abode of the True Son. So that Jesus Christ was righteous, not because righteousness was an attribute essential to Him as God, but merely by the *practice* of virtue and righteousness; not by his *union* but by his communication with the Divine Word.

The horror with which the heresy of Paul inspired them, excited the zeal of the bishops against it, formidable as he was by his power. Dionysius of Alexandria, amongst others, fully refuted him; nevertheless, in order to put the most complete check to so great an evil, the eastern bishops flocked to Antioch from all parts in great numbers, and amongst them were found some of great note, viz. Firmilian of Cesarea in Cappadocia[4], Gregory, bishop of Neocesarea, Helenus of Tarsus in Cilicia, Hymenæus of Jerusalem, Theoc-

[4] He died at Tarsus, on his way to the second council upon the same subject, in 269.

tenus of Cesarea in Palestine, and Maximus of Bostra: there was also a large assemblage of priests and deacons. When they were assembled, a letter was read from Dionysius of Alexandria, who was too ill to be present, animating their zeal for the defence of the truth. What passed in this council is not exactly known; but it seems that two at least were held upon this subject, one in this year, 264, and a second in 269, which was continued in the year following. It is certain, that Paul did every thing in his power to conceal the venom of his heresy, that the bishops declared the true faith with the utmost clearness, and earnestly besought Paul to renounce his heresy, and that he protested that he had never held the errors imputed to him. It would seem that it was in the first council, which assembled A.D. 264, that Firmilian condemned the errors of Paul, who then promised to recant. Subsequent events, however, showed that he had been merely deceiving the bishops, and accordingly the second council was called, where the prelates assembled to the number of seventy, according to S. Athanasius, or eighty as S. Hilary asserts. Then, after having used exhortations and entreaties with Paul, they clearly and unequivocally asserted the union of the Divine and human natures in the One Person of Jesus Christ, and the *Personal* distinction between the Father and the Son, in one and the same substance. Paul being, in the end, convicted of all his errors, and especially of holding that Jesus Christ was merely man, was unanimously deposed and excommunicated, which judgment of the council was further received and confirmed by all the bishops of the whole Church, the decree of the council having been received every where.—*Euseb.* l. vii. c. 28. Tom. i. Conc. pp. 843 and 893. 901.

Antioch, 340.

ANTIOCH. Held about the year 340; about ninety bishops were present. The Eusebians, hearing that S. Athanasius had proceeded to Rome, became alarmed, fearing lest their falsehoods and artifices should be exposed by his presence. In order, therefore, to prevent, as far as lay in their power, what they dreaded, they too, constituted themselves judges in their own cause, and held a council, in which they declared that any bishop, who, after having been deposed, should take upon himself the exercise of his episcopal office, without the authority of a new council, should never be

restored. Then they proceeded to set up at Alexandria a bishop of their own sect, Gregory of Cappadocia, an acknowledged Arian, whose intrusion was accompanied by every possible irregularity and violence, even so far as to employ military force and heathenish cruelties.—*Tillemont.* Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 89. 588.

Antioch, 341. Conc. in Encæniis.

ANTIOCH. Held in 341, by the Eusebians, on the occasion of the dedication of the "Golden" Church at Antioch. The emperor Constantine commenced this work in a style of magnificence worthy of his piety, and Constantius had just completed it; and as Eusebius of Nicomedia lost no opportunity of advancing his schemes, he so managed matters, that under the pretext of dedicating the new church, he assembled a council, of which the real object was to condemn belief in the consubstantiality of the Son. Ninety-seven bishops, of whom forty, at least, were acknowledged Arians, were present. They came chiefly from the following provinces: Syria, Phenicia, Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Cilicia, Isauria, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Thrace. The principal men amongst them were, Eusebius, who had usurped the see of Constantinople, Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neroniadis, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Masis of Macedonia, Acacius of Cesarea, Eudoxius, afterwards of Constantinople, George of Laodicea, and Theophronius of Tyana, in Cappadocia. Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, refused to attend, not forgetting how he had been, upon a former occasion, (in the synod of Tyre,) surprised into subscribing to the condemnation of Athanasius.

No bishop from the west was present at the council, nor any one on the part of the pope. The emperor Constantius, however, who saw only with the eyes of the Arians, attended in person. The sole object of the Eusebians was to crush Athanasius, and accordingly they brought forward again the accusations which had been urged against him in the council of Tyre, and had been repeatedly refuted. Moreover, they alleged against him, on the present occasion, certain murders which had been committed, and which they pretended were caused by his return to Alexandria. In the end he was condemned without a hearing; and they proceeded to draw up three creeds or formularies[5].

[5] According to Pagius, the proceedings against Athanasius were not taken in the council in Encæniis, properly so called, but

Antioch, 341.

In the first they spoke with great reserve of the Son, making use neither of the terms "substance" nor "consubstantial." In the second, they said that He was immutably possessed of the divinity, or, as Socrates and S. Hilary explain their meaning to be, that He was incapable of mutability or change; that He was begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, whole of whole, &c.; the *image* of the Father's Godhead, substance, power, and glory; that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three in hypostasis or person, but one in consent, reducing the unity to a mere unity of will. They seem, also, to have admitted in the Divine Persons a glory peculiar to each; and whilst they denied the Son to be a mere creature, they added, as though He had been no more than this, (just as they expressed themselves when speaking of his divinity,) that He was the first-born of all creatures.

Formulary of Antioch.

The second formulary is styled the "Formulary of Antioch;" and it was approved by the semi-Arians, at the council of Seleucia, in 359.

The third formulary does not materially differ from the last; it was drawn up by Theophonius, bishop of Tyana.

In this council, moreover, various regulations were made; and for many ages, twenty-five canons were attributed to it, which have come down to us. It is Tillemont's opinion that these twenty-five canons, which are excellent, and of great celebrity in the Church, may have been made at a more ancient council, held at Antioch under S. Eustachius. However this may be, although absolutely rejected by pope Innocent and S. Chrysostom, as having been the work of heretics, they were received without difficulty into the code of Church canons, which was confirmed in the council of Chalcedon, although they are not styled canons of the

subsequently, when the orthodox majority had departed, and the Eusebians, who purposely remained, had received news from Rome that their case against Athanasius was likely to be settled in his favour; they then, by confusing the fourth and twelfth canons just passed, concocted another, which condemned him. Thus this author seems to prove, that all the acts of the council, whilst the ninety-seven bishops were present, and during which time the three formularies and the twenty-five canons were drawn up, were regular and orthodox; and that the condemnation of Athanasius, and publication of a fourth erroneous confession of faith, was confined to a pseudo-council composed of the forty Arian bishops only.

council of Antioch. *Fleury. Tillemont. Du Pin. S. Athanasius, Epist. Encyc.* Antioch, 341.

1. Excommunicates those of the laity who set aside the decree of Nicea concerning the festival of Easter; deposes, and deprives, and declares to be aliens from the Church, any bishops, priests, or deacons guilty of so doing.

2. Orders that all those who come to church only *to hear* the sacred Scriptures, and do not communicate in prayer, or turn away from the holy eucharist, shall be cast out of the Church. Forbids intercourse with the excommunicated.

3. Forbids priests and deacons to absent themselves from their churches.

4. Deprives of all hope of future restoration a bishop deposed by the synod, or a priest or deacon by his own bishop, who shall dare to perform any part of divine service.

5. Enacts that if any presbyter or deacon, despising his own bishop, has separated himself from the Church, and collected a private congregation, and refused to attend and submit upon a first and second summons from his bishop, he shall be utterly deprived, without further remedy. And if he persists in troubling and disturbing the Church, he shall be corrected by the secular power.

6. Forbids the bishop to receive any one excommunicated by another bishop.

7. Strangers not to be received without letters of peace.

9. Orders all the bishops of a province to obey the metropolitan, and to give him precedence.

10. Permits the chorepiscopi to ordain readers, subdeacons, and exorcists; forbids them to dare to ordain either priests or deacons without the bishop.

11. No bishop or priest to go to the emperor without the consent, in writing, of the bishops of the province and the metropolitan, and without letters from them.

12. Deprives of all hope of restoration a deposed priest or deacon, who shall carry his complaint to the emperor instead of the synod of bishops.

13. Deposes a bishop who presumes to ordain in another province.

14. Orders that if the bishops in synod, when sitting in judgment upon the conduct of any bishop,

cannot agree in their verdict, the metropolitan shall call in some from a neighbouring province.

15. No appeal to be allowed from the unanimous decision of the provincial synod.

16. A bishop not chosen in a perfect synod, i. e. where the metropolitan is present, to be cast out, even though elected by all the people.

17. Excommunicates a bishop who, after consecration, refuses to exercise his office.

19. Forbids to consecrate a bishop without a synod: the appointment to be made with the consent of, at least the majority of the bishops of the province.

20. Two provincial synods to be held annually: one, three weeks after Easter, and the other on the ides of October. All who think themselves aggrieved may come for redress.

21. Forbids translations.

22. Forbids bishops to interfere in the church of another bishop.

23. Forbids a bishop to appoint his successor. Such appointments to be void.

24. Declares that Church property ought to be preserved with the utmost care, and administered by the bishop. Allows bishops to leave by will their own private property, but not that of the Church.

25. Gives the bishop power over the possessions of the Church: permits him to partake of what he requires for his own necessary use, and for purposes of hospitality; forbids him to pervert the Church revenue to his own family purposes.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 89. *Fleury*. *Hammond's Canons of the Church*, p. 153.

Antioch, 345. Pseudo-Synod.

ANTIOCH. Held by the Arian bishops in 345, in which they drew up a long explication of their faith, commonly known as the μακρόστιχος, or large confession, containing, first, the formulary of Antioch, mentioned in the preceding council, to which they added a prolix explication of the principal articles, and opposed the heresies of Paul of Samosata, Photinus, Sabellius, and others. This formulary was sent to the western bishops, assembled at Milan. See C. Milan, 346.

Antioch, 360.

ANTIOCH. Held in 360. Meletius, bishop of Sebastia, was unanimously elected patriarch of Antioch, the Arian party flattering themselves that he would support their views; but in the council, although

violence was used to prevent him, he testified boldly before the emperor, in defence of the Catholic faith, upon the subject of the nature of the Son. The Arians, enraged by his discourse, so prejudiced the mind of the emperor against him, that in a council held in the following year, at which Constantius himself was present, he was accused of Sabellianism, and banished. The Arians, at the same time, published a formulary of faith.—*Fleury. Sozom.* iv. 28. *Theod.* ii. 31. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 96. 807.

ANTIOCH. Held in 363, under Jovian. Acacius of Cesarea and his party, seeing the good opinion which this prince had conceived of Meletius, entered upon a conference with him, which was the cause of this council. Twenty-seven bishops attended from different provinces; of these the principal were, Meletius, Eusebius of Samosata, and Acacius of Cesarea. They unanimously agreed upon a letter to the emperor, in which they confessed the doctrine of consubstantiality, and agreed to the faith as settled at Nicea, inserting in the letter the Nicene creed, which they received as the exposition of the true faith; especially admitting the term "consubstantial[6]" as expressing that the Son is of the same substance with the Father.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 825. *Socr.* l. iii. c. 25. Antioch, 363.

ANTIOCH. Held in the year 380. Although this council was gathered from the whole of the East, and may be considered as one of the most important, not a trace of it is to be found in the writings of the historians; all that is known of it is from the Roman collection of Holstenius, tom. i. p. 165, where it is said, that the epistle of the council of Rome, under Damasus, having been circulated in the East, the whole eastern Church assembled at Antioch, without a dissentient voice received it, and every bishop subscribed it: amongst others, Meletius of Antioch, Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, &c. This letter authoritatively set forth the faith of the Catholic Church upon the subjects of the blessed Antioch, 380.

[6] "Quandoquidem vocabulum *consubstantialis* quod quibusdam videtur parum recte in ea (the Nicene Creed) positum, est probe a Patribus commodaque interpretatione explanatum. Quæ quidem interpretatio ostendit Filium ex Patris substantia genitum Patri secundum substantiam similem."

Trinity, the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and the errors of Apollinarius.—*Tillemont.*

Antioch, 391. ANTIOCH. Held about the year 391. Flavianus, the bishop, assisted by several priests and deacons, condemned and anathematized the errors of the Massalians, who regarded the sacraments as useless, and made Christian perfection to consist in prayer alone.

Antioch, 417. ANTIOCH. Held, most probably, at the end of the year 417, under Theodotus of Antioch, Praylius, the successor of John in the see of Jerusalem, being present. Heri, Heros, and Lazarus, again accused Pelagius of heresy, who had been acquitted in the council of Diospolis by the influence of John of Jerusalem; he was condemned, and letters to that effect were written to the pope. The acts and letters of the council have perished.—*Marii Mercatoris Opera, Studio Garnerii, Disser.* ii. *de Synodis, &c.* p. 207. *Tillemont.*

Antioch, 433. ANTIOCH. Held in 433, by order of the emperor Theodosius. In this council the heresy of Nestorius was condemned by John of Antioch, and this last named prelate was reconciled to S. Cyril, as the emperor had commanded.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1265.

Antioch, 435. ANTIOCH. A general eastern council, held in the year 435. Three synodal letters were written by this council, to the emperor, to Proclus, and to S. Cyril, respectively. In the last, the memory of Theodorus, of Mopsuestia (whom certain monks of Constantinople had required should be anathematized, and his writings condemned) was defended; the bishops, speaking of his "Extracts," express themselves thus: "We allow that there are doubtful passages, which may be understood in a sense differing from that intended by the writer; but there are many abundantly clear. And as to those which appear obscure, we find similar passages in the ancient writers; so that if we condemn the former, we also cast a reflection upon the latter. What endless confusion will it not lead us into, if we allow the opinions fo the fathers who are dead to be combated! It is one thing not to approve entirely of some few of their opinions, and another to anathematize them; especially if the anathema be extended to themselves personally. . . . May not Theodore have been compelled to express himself thus, in order to contend effectually with the

heresies which he, as the common defender of the East, opposed?"

In their letter to Proclus, the same bishops wrote: "It is not our office to judge those who have died in the faith; that belongs to God alone, who is the judge of the living and of the dead." S. Cyril, however, made a reply to the council, in which he said, that he implored them not to attribute to the holy fathers Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and others, the infamous opinions of such men as Diodorus and Theodorus, who openly impeached the glory of Jesus Christ, lest by so doing they should give occasion to scandal.—*Fleury, Col. Baluz.* p. 943.

AQUILEA. [*Concilium Aquileinse.*] Held in 381, under Valerian of Aquilea and S. Ambrose of Milan. Palladius, bishop of Illyria, and Secundianus, having been accused of Arianism, in order to justify themselves, demanded of the emperor Gratian that they might be tried by a general council of the eastern Church. Gratian acceded to this request, so far as to permit any bishop who might desire it to come to Aquilea, but without compelling any. The bishops of most of the provinces of the West attended, viz., from Italy and from the Gauls; amongst others, the bishops of Orange and Marseilles, acting as deputies for Gaul; two bishops, also, from Africa; and Annemius, the bishop of Sirmium, the capital of Illyria; in all, thirty-two bishops. But if this number was small, the eminent qualities of those who were present (viz. S. Ambrose, S. Valerian of Aquilea, Eusebius of Bologna, Justus of Lyons, &c.) well compensated for the want of numbers. Palladius and Secundianus were the only Arian bishops present. The whole of the western Church took part in this council, at which Valerian of Aquilea presided, although S. Ambrose was the soul of it, conducting every thing. Aquilea, 381.

The bishops assembled on the 3rd Sept., when Palladius and Secundianus endeavoured in vain to prevent the question from being brought forward. The impiety of Palladius appearing clearly by his answers and his conduct, he was pronounced unworthy of the priestly office, and deposed from the episcopate, as was Secundianus. The decrees of the council were then transmitted to the emperors Theodosius and Gratian, together with an entreaty that they would support them by

their authority. The council further requested, that in order to remove the schism which had divided the Church of Antioch since the year 362, one party being formed under Meletius, supported by the whole eastern Church, and another under Paulinus, who was favoured by the West, a council should be called at Alexandria, to be composed of all Catholic bishops, in order that it might be settled to whom communion should be granted and refused. This gave rise to the council of Rome, in the year following, viz. in 382.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 978.

Aquilea, 1409. Not recognized.

AQUILEA. Held in 1409, near Udine, in the diocese of Aquilea, by Gregory XII., whilst endeavours were being made at Pisa to depose him. He held the first session on the 6th of June, but he put off the second until the 22nd, on account of the small number of bishops who attended. He here pronounced sentence against Pedro of Luna, and Alexander V.; he declared them to be schismatical, and their elections null, void, and sacrilegious. And further, in the last session, on the 5th Sept., he agreed to resign the pontificate, if his two competitors would promise to resign their alleged claims to it also; however, he added a condition to this promise which seems to show that his real object was to hinder concord.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2012.

Aquilea, 1594.

AQUILEA. Held in 1594. Sixteen canons of faith and discipline, formed upon those of Trent, were published.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1471.

Arabia, 247.

ARABIA. [*Concilium Arabicum.*] Held in 247, against the Helcesaitans, who maintained that the soul dies together with the body, and will be raised to life again with it in the resurrection, according to Eusebius and the synodicon of Fabricius. Origen was invited to this council, and boldly combated these errors, by which means he brought back the heretics to the true faith.—*Eus.* vi. c. 37. Tom. i. Conc. p. 650.

Arenda, 1473.

ARENDA. [*Concilium Arendense.*] Held in Dec. 1473, at Arenda, in Spain, in order that some remedy might be applied to correct the ignorance and immorality of the clergy. Alphonso, archbishop of Toledo, with his suffragans, made there twenty-nine rules of discipline, amongst which are the following: viz. that no one shall be admitted to holy orders who is not acquainted with Latin; that the clergy shall not wear mourning; that bishops shall not appear in public without the rochette; that they shall never wear any gar-

ment made of silk; that they shall cause the Holy Scriptures to be read at their table, &c. The other canons relate to such cases as fornication amongst the clergy, clandestine marriages, simony, shows and dramatic representations held in churches, sports forbidden to clerks, duels, rapes, &c. This is the same with the council of Toledo of the same year.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1448.

ARIMINUM. [*Concilium Ariminense.*] Held in 359, by order of the emperor Constantius, at Ariminum in Romania. All the bishops of the West were summoned, the emperor promising to supply them with the means of travelling and subsistence[7]. The whole number present was about four hundred, collected from Italy, Illyria, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and England. Of this number eighty were Arians, headed by Ursaces and Valens. Ariminum, 359.

The Catholic bishops, amongst whom was Restitutus of Carthage, wished, at the very outset, to anathematize the Arian and all other heresies, but this was opposed by Ursaces and Valens, who objected to the use of the word "consubstantial," maintaining that it was far better to use the expression "like to the Father in all things," than to employ new words, which only served to create divisions, and which, moreover, were not to be found in Scripture; and they then presented to the assembly a new formulary of faith, which they had privately drawn up. The orthodox bishops answered, that they had no need of any new formulary—that they had met together there not to learn what they ought to believe, but to oppose those who set themselves against the truth, and who introduced novelties; that it was necessary to condemn the doctrine of Arius, and, without disguise, to receive that of Nicea. Then they declared the formulary of Valens and Ursaces to be utterly at variance with the true faith, and confirmed the acts of Nicea, asserting that nothing whatever should be added to them.

As Valens and his party refused to acquiesce in this decision, the council proceeded to declare them heretics, and excommunicated and deposed them. This decree was signed by three hundred and twenty bishops; and

[7] This offer was refused, amongst others, by the British bishops who were present, except three, who were too poor to maintain themselves.—*Cave.*

Ariminum, 359. the doctrine of Arius, as well as that of Photinus and Sabellius, was anathematized.

Up to this point, therefore, that is, whilst the fathers of the council had liberty of action granted to them, the Catholic faith was triumphant in the council of Ariminum.

But after this decision both parties made their representation of the matter to the emperor. The Catholics, by the ten deputies whom they sent, declared that they could decide upon no step better calculated to confirm the true faith than to keep close to the Creed of Nicea, which they highly eulogized, without adding to or taking from it. They then alluded to the opposition made by Valens and his party, and showed that they had been forced by their conduct to excommunicate them.

The Arians, on the other hand, by the deputies whom they sent to the emperor, prejudiced his mind against the Catholics; and showed him their formulary of faith, which the latter had rejected, but with which the emperor found no fault. Thus, when the Catholic deputies arrived at Constantinople, they were refused an audience, and were, for a long time, upon one pretext or other, kept without any answer; the emperor delaying matters, with the hope that the bishops, wearied out, and separated from their churches, would at last yield to his wishes, and give up the terms "substance" and "consubstantial."

Further, the Arians having compelled the ten deputies of the council, in spite of themselves, to come to Nice in Thrace, and having intimidated them by threats, and worn them out by violence and ill-usage, obliged them at last to consent to abandon the two obnoxious expressions, and to receive a confession conformable to that drawn up at Sirmium two years before; in fact, they obliged them to become parties to an act of union with the Arians, and to renounce all that had been done at Ariminum.

The emperor, in the mean time, sent orders to the prefect, Taurus, not to suffer the council to separate until this confession, which entirely suppressed the words *οὐσία* and *ὁμοούσιος*, had been subscribed by all the bishops. All of them, with the exception of twenty, gave way to the violence and ill-usage to which they were subjected, and signed this confession of faith,

known as the formulary of Nice or Ariminum. In order to induce them the more readily to comply, the Arians endeavoured to persuade them that they could not, without wrong, reject a scheme of faith produced, as they falsely pretended, by the oriental bishops; and added, that if the formulary, in some parts, appeared not sufficiently clear to them, they were at liberty to make what additions they pleased. The Catholic bishops joyfully availed themselves of this seeming door of escape, and quickly drew up certain propositions containing a condemnation of Arius, and declaring the equality of the Son to the Father, and his existence from all eternity; but when they were completed, Valens craftily persuaded them to add that the Son was not a creature like other creatures; thus, in fact, inducing the simple bishops, who intended nothing less, to acknowledge Him to be but a creature. When this triumph over the truth was completed, a deputation, headed by Valens and Ursaces, was sent to Constantius; and the formulary, thus shamefully signed, was circulated throughout the eastern part of the empire, with orders to exile all who should refuse to sign it: and in this way the signatures of a large number of bishops were obtained, some sooner, some later, either through fear, or ignorance, or bribery. Ariminum, 359.

But although the number of signatures thus obtained was very great, it by no means appears that the majority of bishops in the Church signed it; amongst those who made a noble stand in defence of the true faith, were Liberius of Rome [8], Vincentius of Capua, Gregory of Elvira, S. Athanasius, Hilary of Poitiers, and Lucifer of Cagliari. Most of those bishops, moreover, who had fallen into the snare laid for them by the Arians, quickly acknowledged their fault, when their eyes were opened. S. Hilary says, that the acts of the council of Ariminum were annulled throughout the world, and the pope Liberius assured the whole East, that they who had been deceived or overcome at Ariminum, had since returned to the truth, and that they had anathematized the confession agreed to in

[8] Liberius, who had been weak enough to yield an outward assent to the Arian doctrines for a time, had before this renounced his errors, and returned to the profession of the Catholic faith.

that council, and had subscribed the Nicene Creed.—Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 791—801.

Arles, 314.

ARLES. [*Concilium Arelatense.*] A general council of the West, held in 314, by the emperor Constantine upon the subject of the Donatists. The emperor, in order to get rid of the importunities of these schismatics, who were dissatisfied with the council of Rome in the preceding year, granted them a fresh hearing, which gave rise to this council. The number of bishops present was very large, from Africa, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and, above all, from the Gauls. Amongst the names subscribed we find those of the bishops of Arles, Lyons, Vienne, Marseilles, Autun, Rheims, Cologne, Rouen, and Bordeaux. Pope Sylvester sent two priests and two deacons.

It appears that the matter was examined with even greater care than at Rome in the preceding year; Cecilianus was acquitted, and his accusers condemned. It was also ruled by this council, in opposition to the general practice before this time in the African Church, that persons who have received the form of baptism at the hand of heretics, ought not to be re-baptized, and that if it shall appear from their answer, that they have been baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, it shall be enough, that they be confirmed in order to receive the Holy Ghost.

Here were also composed the twenty-two celebrated canons of discipline, which bear the name of this council.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 1421.

Arles, 353. Not recognized.

ARLES. Held in 353, by Constantius the emperor. This prince, happening to be in Arles, lent himself to every thing that the Eusebians suggested to him. Already they had invited the pope Liberius to attend the council, who, however, sent Vincentius, the aged bishop of Capua, and Marcellus, a Campanian bishop, to demand of Constantius, that the place of rendezvous should be Aquilea instead of Arles. Many other bishops also came to Arles to request the same thing; but reasonable as the request was, Constantius took offence at it. In the council the first thing which the Arians required was the condemnation of S. Athanasius. As Vincentius, on his part, insisted that the true faith should be set forth and defended; but Valens and his accomplices persisted in requiring, that before any

thing else was done, the legates should renounce communion with Athanasius; which they, carried away by the example of others, and, it may be, induced by threats, did, promising no more to communicate with him. When, however, the council had gained this point, they refused to condemn Arius.

Photinus of Sirmium, Marcellus of Ancyra, and S. Athanasius were condemned here.

The fall of Vincentius and the other legate overwhelmed the pope with grief; and Vincentius himself appears to have felt most deeply the sin he had committed, declaring that he desired nothing else than to die for the sake of Christ, whom he had thus calumniated, and the truth of whose Gospel he had violated: so he expresses himself in a letter which he wrote to Hosius, from which S. Hilary has preserved an extract. He returned to the orthodox faith, and by his after conduct effaced the disgrace which was attached to him on account of his fall. It ought, however, to be said, that the disgraceful cowardice of the orthodox at this council was not universal: Paulinus, bishop of Treves, maintained the true faith with a constancy worthy of an apostolic man, and drew upon himself the punishment of exile, on account of the horror which he testified of the Arians, and of the determination which he showed not to participate in the oppression of an innocent man, by signing the calumnious accusation which they had drawn up against Athanasius. Constantius tried to wear out his patience by changing his place of exile, and by banishing him to places where the name of Christ was not worshipped, and which were infected with the heresy of Montanus and of Maximilian; he, however, continued firm to the day of his death.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 770.

ARLES. In the year 428 or 429, a numerous council of the French bishops was held either at Arles or Troyes, at which deputies from the English Church were present, seeking help against the heresy of Pelagius, which was spreading rapidly in that kingdom. Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, were deputed by the council, with the pope's approbation, to proceed to England, in order that, "having confounded the heretics, they might lead back the Britons to the Catholic faith." Baronius gives 429 as the date of this council. For the reasons for preferring 428,

Arles, 428 or 429.

and for assigning Arles for its place of meeting, see "Marii Mercatoris Opera, Studio J. Garnerii," Dissert. ii. p. 231.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1686.

Arles, 442. ARLES. Held about the year 442. This seems to have been a council gathered from several ecclesiastical provinces, since it speaks of the obligation of the metropolitans to submit to its decrees, and gives to itself the title of *great* council. It was assembled by S. Hilary, the bishop of Arles; during its sitting, fifty-six canons were drawn up, almost entirely compiled from those of the first council of Arles, in 314, those of Nicea, Orange, and Vaison. Amongst other regulations, it was forbidden to raise to the rank of sub-deacon, any one who had married a widow, agreeably to the decree of the council of Valence in 374. According to Pagi, this council gave occasion of offence to S. Leo against S. Hilary, who assumed to himself the right of assembling councils in Gaul.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1010.

Arles, 453. ARLES. Held about the year 453. The subscriptions of the bishops are lost. Fifty-six canons were published, many of which are taken from the councils of Nicea, Constantinople, and Orange.

10 and 11. Relate to the penance of those who relapsed in time of persecution.

15. Forbids a deacon to administer the communion when a priest is present.

26. Permits a priest to grant the chrism to heretics at the point of death, who wish to become Catholics. —Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1010.

Arles, 455. ARLES. Held in 455, under Ravennius, bishop of Arles, owing to a dispute between Faustus, abbot of the monastery of Lerins[1], and Theodore, bishop of Frejus, concerning the jurisdiction of the latter over the monastery. Thirteen bishops were present; and it was determined that ordinations should be celebrated by the bishop of Frejus alone, and that no clerk, not belonging to the monastery, should be received into communion or to minister without the bishop's licence. Theodore, on his part, leaving the care of the lay portion of the monastery in the hands of the abbot.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1023.

Arles, 475. ARLES. Held about the year 475. The errors of

[1] This celebrated monastery was situated on the small island of Lerins, near Marseilles, now called the Island of St. Honorat.

Lucidus having excited the zeal of Faustus, bishop of Riez, he endeavoured in several conferences to bring him back to the true faith. From the letters of Faustus, we learn what were the errors of Lucidus, for all his exhortations having proved useless, he at last wrote to the latter a letter, containing six articles, which he desired him to anathematize: 1st, the errors of Pelagius, viz. that man is born without sin, that he is able to save himself by his own works, and to be delivered without the grace of God. 2dly, That which teaches that he who falls after baptism *perishes in original sin*. 3dly, That man is made subject to the power of death by the foreknowledge of God. 4thly, That those who shall perish have no power to save themselves, including those who have been baptized, and the heathen who might have believed but would not. 5thly, That a "vessel of dishonour" cannot become a "vessel of honour." 6thly, That Jesus Christ did not die for all men, and does not will that all should be saved. This letter was signed by eleven other bishops, but the see of one only of them is known, viz. Patiens, bishop of Lyons. Whilst, therefore, Lucidus delayed making his recantation, this council was assembled at Arles, composed of thirty bishops. The ground for supposing that *Arles* was the place of assembly is this, that the name of Leontius, who was then bishop of that see, occurs first upon the list, and after his the names of Euphremius, Mamertius, Patiens, Eutropius, Faustus, Basil, &c. According to Faustus, they spoke strongly upon the subject of predestination, condemned the opinions which Lucidus had advanced upon the subject, and further insisted that he should condemn them himself. Lucidus obeyed, and addressed a letter to the bishops composing the council, in which he retracted his errors; which, however, are not identical with the propositions contained in the letter of Faustus. Arles, 475.

Some imagine that Faustus himself drew up this recantation of Lucidus. Du Pin, at least, asserts that there are many things in it which savour strongly of Pelagianism. The condemnation of the errors of Lucidus, in this council, forms one of the proofs brought forward to show the existence of a sect of Predestinarians. The reader may see long dissertations upon the subject by cardinal Noris, Pagi, and Alexander: the last shows that the errors of the Predestinarians

were the same with those of which the priests of Marseilles accused S. Augustin and his disciples. He allows, nevertheless, that the number of those comprising the sect of Predestinarians was very small, and proves such to have been the case, by the wording of this 25th canon of Orange: "Not only do we not believe that some men are predestinated by the Divine power to evil, but further, we, with the utmost detestation, anathematize those, if *there be any*, (si qui sunt,) who are willing to believe so grievous a thing." Upon which words, Alexander remarks, "The fathers used this form of speaking, 'si qui sunt,' because the followers and disciples of Lucidus were few and of no repute."

But to return to Faustus, he adds, after having related what passed in the council, that Leontius gave him a charge to collect together all that had been said upon the subject of Predestination, which he did, in two books upon Grace and Free-will, addressed to Leontius; but, according to Fleury, he erred in the opposite extreme, making too much of man's natural strength.

The learned Benedictine, Dom. Maur, in his list of certain and known councils, speaks in express terms concerning those of Arles and Lyons; that they are only known to us through the writings of Faustus of Riez,—writings, he adds, which savour strongly of semi-Pelagianism, and which, as such, were ranked amongst apocryphal books by the council of pope Gelasius, in 496.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1041.

Arles, 524. ARLES. Held in 524, under Cæsarius, bishop of Arles. Sixteen bishops were present, and four canons were drawn up relating to ordinations, one of which enacts, that no man be made deacon under twenty-five years of age.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1622.

Arles, 554. ARLES. Held in 554, under Sapaudus, archbishop of Arles. Here seven canons were drawn up, the second and fifth of which are to the effect, that monasteries, whether for men or women, should be placed under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 779.

Arles, 813. ARLES. Held in May, 813. Convoked by order of Charlemagne, for the correction of abuses and the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. The number of canons made was twenty-six. Amongst other things

it was ruled, that bishops ought to be well-instructed in the Holy Scriptures and in the canons of the Church, and that their sole occupation should consist in preaching and instructing others. 2. That all shall pray for the king and his family. 15. Orders just weights and measures every where. 17. Enjoins that bishops shall visit their dioceses annually. 19. That parents should instruct their childern, and god-parents those for whom they had answered at the font. The 21st, orders, that with regard to burials in churches, the ancient canons shall be observed.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1231.

ARLES. Held on the 8th July, 1234, under John Baussan, archbishop of Arles. Twenty-four canons were enacted, chiefly directed against the *Albigenses and Waldenses*, enforcing those of Lateran in 1215, and of Toulouse in 1229. Bishops are directed to preach the Catholic faith frequently, both themselves and by means of others. All confraternities are forbidden, except those which have the sanction of the bishop. Bishops are directed to apply themselves diligently to the correction of morals, especially amongst the clergy; and for that purpose they are enjoined to have *spies* in every diocese. No one was permitted to make a will save in the presence of the curate of his parish. Arles, 1234.

The reason given for this last injunction, which is very common in the acts of councils about this time, is, that persons who favoured the opinions of the heretics, might be thereby prevented from assisting them with legacies.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2339.

ARLES. Held in 1261, or subsequently, by Florentine, archbishop of Arles, with his suffragans, against the extravagances of the Joachimites, who said that the Father had operated from the creation until the coming of Jesus Christ; that from that time to the year 1260, Jesus Christ had operated; and that from 1260 unto the end of the world, the Holy Spirit would operate. That under the operation of the Father, men lived after the flesh; under that of the Son, they lived partly after the flesh and partly after the Spirit; but that during the third period, they would live more entirely after the Spirit. Arles, 1261.

Seventeen canons were also drawn up, in the third of which it is enjoined that confirmation shall be administered and received *fasting*, except in the case of infants at the breast. This shows that the confirmation of little children was at this time still practised in the

Church. The fifth canon orders, that in all parish churches belonging to the religious, curates taken from the community, or perpetual vicars, shall be appointed, with a suitable provision out of the proceeds of the benefice. And further, it forbids the regulars to receive the people to the holy office in the churches attached to their priories, &c. on Sundays or other holydays, or to preach during those hours in which mass was said in the parish church, in order that the laity might not be drawn away from the instruction of their own parochial minister. The seventh canon forbids the use of wooden candles painted to look like wax in churches, processions, &c.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2359.

Arles, 1257. ARLES. Held about the year 1257, by Bertrand de S. Martin, archbishop of Arles. Twenty-two canons were drawn up, of which the first are lost.

7. Forbids to sell or pawn the chalices, books, and other ornaments of the Church, under pain of excommunication.

12. and 13. Of cases to be reserved to the bishop or pope.

14. Forbids all persons in holy orders to buy corn or wine for the purpose of selling it again.

16. Orders silver chalices in churches.—Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2369.

Armagh, 1171. ARMAGH. [*Concilium Armachianum.*] Held in 1171, ordered that all the English who had been kept in a state of slavery in Ireland, should be set free. The council acknowledged that the Irish were subject to the authority of England.

This appears to be the same with the council of Waterford, A.D. 1158, in Labbe, Tom. x. Conc. p. 1183. Tom. x. Conc. p. 1452; *Wilkins*, Conc. vol. i. p. 471.

Arragon, 1062. ARRAGON. [*Concilium Arragonense.*] Held in 1062, when it was decided that the bishops of Arragon should be chosen from the monks of the monastery of St. Jean de Rocca.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1173.

Arras, 1025. ARRAS. [*Concilium Attrebatense.*] Held in the year 1025, chiefly upon the subject of the holy sacraments, against certain heretics who had come from Italy, seventeen chapters were published.

Attigni-sur-Aisne, 765. ATTIGNI-SUR-AISNE. [*Concilium Attiniacense.*] Held in the year 765, Chodegrand of Metz presided, assisted by twenty-seven bishops and seventeen abbots. All that remains to us of their acts is the promise,

which they made amongst themselves, that when any one of them died, the rest should each cause the psalter to be chanted a hundred times, and a hundred masses to be said by his priests, and should himself say thirty. Such promises are not unfrequent in the councils of this period.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1702.

ATTIGNI. Held in 822. In this council Louis le Débonnaire, by the advice of his bishops and lords, was reconciled to his three younger brothers, Hugues, Drogon, and Theodoric, upon whom he had forcibly imposed the tonsure. He made open confession of this act, and of his rigour towards his nephew Bernard, king of Italy, and towards the abbot Adelhardus, and Wala his brother. He then performed penance openly, in imitation of the emperor Theodosius. He at the same time evinced a desire to rectify the abuses which had been introduced through the neglect of the bishops and great lords. He also confirmed the rule for canons and for monks, which had been made at Aix-la-Chapelle. —Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1529. Attigni, 822.

ATTIGNI. Held in May, 870, thirty bishops attending from ten provinces. The king, Charles the Bald, was present; in it he brought to judgment his son Carloman. Hincmar, bishop of Laon, accused of disobedience to the king, was compelled to promise fidelity to him, and also to Hincmar, his uncle, archbishop of Rheims; but he afterwards withdrew, and wrote to the pope, complaining of the conduct of the king and the archbishop, which was the cause of a quarrel between the pope and the king, the former taking part with Hincmar of Laon, who had all along supported the papal encroachments in opposition to his uncle.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 1537. Attigni, 870.

AUCH. [*Concilium Auscense.*] A council of the province called by Hugo the White, legate. It was ordered that all the churches of Gascony should pay a quarter of the tithe to the cathedral. S. Orens and a few others being exempted.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1195. Auch, 1068.

AUGSBURG. [*Concilium Augustanum.*] Held on the 7th Aug., 952. Twenty-four bishops from Germany and Lombardy were present at it, amongst whom Uldaric, bishop of Augsburg, was the most illustrious. They made eleven canons. It was forbidden to all the clergy, from the bishop to the subdeacon, to marry, or to have women in their houses, or to keep dogs or birds Augsburg, 952.

for sporting, or to play at any game of chance. The sixth canon orders that all monks shall submit to the bishop of the diocese, and receive his correction.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 635.

Augsburg, 1548. AUGSBURG. Held on the 12th Nov., 1548, by Cardinal Otho, bishop of Augsburg, at Dillenghen upon the Danube. Thirty-three regulations were drawn up relating to discipline and morality. Amongst other things it was ordered, that open sinners should be proceeded against canonically, and that those who were found incorrigible should be handed over to the grand vicar: that the deans of chapters should watch over the conduct of the canons, and be careful to punish those who were guilty of drunkenness, gaming, debauchery, fornication, &c.: that those who were possessed of many benefices should resign all but one within a year; that those of the monks who neglected their rule, and were guilty of drunkenness or immodest conduct, or who were suspected of heresy, should be corrected: that nuns and other female religious should not leave their monasteries, nor suffer any man to enter them, unless for some absolute necessity: that preachers should not advance any thing untrue or doubtful; that they should accommodate their sermons to the capacity of their hearers: that they should avoid all obscure and perplexing subjects: that one uniform order should be observed in the administration of the sacraments, and no money be taken for the same, according to the apostolical traditions, the ancient canons, laws, and usages: that none but serious tunes should be played upon organs: that every thing profane should be entirely done away with in all solemn processions.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 567.

Autun, 677. AUTUN[1]. [*Concilium Augustodunense.*] Held in the year 677. Six canons made in this council have come down to us, one of which orders that all priests and others of the clergy shall commit to memory the creed called the Creed of S. Athanasius. This is supposed to be the first time that this creed was spoken of in France under the name of S. Athanasius.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 535.

Autun, 1065. AUTUN. Held in the matter of Robert, duke of Burgundy, whom Hugo, abbot of Clugny, brought before the council, and induced to make satisfaction to

[1] According to Pagi this council was held in 663.

Haganon, bishop of Autun and others, whom he had plundered and otherwise injured.—*Richard. Dict. Univ.*, vol. i. p. 464. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1183.

AUTUN. Held by order of pope Gregory VII. by his legate, Hugo, bishop of Die, in 1077. Several French and Burgundian bishops and abbots attended. Manasser of Rheims, who having been cited, refused to appear, was suspended from the exercise of his office, having been accused of simony, and of usurping that archbishopric. Certain other French bishops were brought to judgment at the same time.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 360. Autun, 1077.

AUTUN. Held on the 16th October, 1094, by Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, and legate, assisted by thirty-two bishops and several abbots. They renewed the sentence of excommunication against the emperor Henry and the anti-pope Guibert; also, they excommunicated for the first time Philip of France, for marrying Bertrade during the lifetime of his lawful wife; but Philip, by a deputation to the pope, averted the storm for awhile, and obtained a delay in the execution of the sentence until the feast of All-Saints, in the following year.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 499. Autun, 1094.

AUVERGNE. [*Concilium Arvernense.*] Held in 533, with the consent of king Theodebert; Honoratus of Bourges presiding. Sixteen canons were published. Auvergne, 533.

3. Forbids to wrap the bodies of the dead in the consecrated cloths.

6. Forbids marriage between Christians and Jews.

7. Forbids to place the coverlet used to be laid over the body of the Lord upon the corpse of a priest.

12. Of incestuous marriages.

15. Orders the country priests to celebrate the feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide with their bishops in the city.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1804.

AUXERRE. [*Concilium Autissiodorense.*] Held about the year 578, under the bishop Aunacairius, with seven abbots and thirty-four priests of his diocese. Forty-five canons were enacted, which, however, appear to have been made solely to enforce the execution of those of the council of Mâçon in the preceding year. Auxerre, 578.

9. Forbids dances, singing of women, and feasting within churches.

10. Forbids two masses to be said at the same altar in one day.

12. Forbids to give the holy eucharist or the kiss to the dead.

13. Forbids the deacon to wear a pall or veil (*velum*) over his shoulders.

14. Forbids burials in the baptistery.

15. Forbids to bury one corpse upon another.

16. Forbids work on Sundays.

17. Forbids to receive the oblations of suicides.

19. Forbids priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, after having broken their fast, ever to be present in church during mass.

26. Forbids a woman to receive the eucharist with her hand bare.

40. Forbids a priest to dance or sing at feasts.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 956.

Avignon, 1060. AVIGNON. [*Concilium Avenionense.*] Held in the year 1060, by the cardinal Hugo, abbot of Clugny, legate. Aehard, who had usurped the see of Arles, was deposed, and Gibelin elected in his place. Lantelme was also elected to the see of Embrun; Hugo to that of Grenoble; Desiderius to that of Cavaillon.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 390.

Avignon, 1209. AVIGNON. Held on the 6th of September, 1209, by Hugo, archbishop of Riez, composed of two legates, four archbishops, twenty bishops, and several abbots. Twenty-one canons were made. The first recommends to bishops to preach more frequently in their dioceses than they had lately done, and attributes the prevailing heresies and corruption of morals to their neglect. The second relates to the extermination of heresies. The preface to the acts of this council states, that charity had become exceeding cold, that corruptions abounded on all sides to such a degree, that nearly all men were plunged into an abyss of vice and wickedness, and that the intention of the council was to remedy these evils and to renew the ancient laws.

In a council held the following year, or in this, as Mansi thinks, the inhabitants of Toulouse were excommunicated, because they had not driven out the Albigenses according to order. The count of Toulouse also was excommunicated, although conditionally.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 41.

Avignon, 1279. AVIGNON. Held on the 27th of May, 1279, by Pierre, (or, according to some, Bernard,) de Languissel,

archbishop of Arles. They drew up a decree containing fifteen articles, for the most part setting forth the usurpations and invasions of ecclesiastical property which were made, the violence committed upon the clergy, and the disregard of excommunications.

However, they provided no other means of opposing these evils than the passing fresh censures.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1050.

AVIGNON. Held in 1282, by Bertrand Amauri, archbishop of Arles, together with his suffragans. Of the canons published ten only are extant, which amongst other things enjoined the faithful to attend their own parish churches, which in many places were disregarded, and to go there, at least, on every Sunday and holy day.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1174. Avignon, 1282.

AVIGNON. Held on the 18th of June, 1326. Three archbishops, eleven bishops, and the deputies of several others, who were absent, attended. They drew up a rule containing fifty-nine articles, chiefly relating to the temporalities of the Church and its jurisdiction. They assume, generally, as an incontrovertible maxim, that the laity have no authority over persons or property ecclesiastical; a maxim evidently false, if it is to be extended to every possible case. Moreover, they complain bitterly of various abuses proceeding from the hatred which the laity bore towards the clergy; but it does not appear that they took any steps to lessen the grounds of this hatred, unless it were by an accumulation of censures and temporal penalties:— Avignon, 1326.

1. Orders that the mass of the blessed Virgin be celebrated once a week.

3. Grants an indulgence to those who pray to God for the pope.

4. Grants an indulgence of ten days to those who devoutly bow the head at the name of Jesus.

14. Orders the secular powers to forward a captured clerk to his own judge free of expense.

17, 18. Against administering poisonous drugs.

19. Of proceedings against the exempt.

44. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all abusive conversations in the houses of bishops, or in the presence of their officials.

46. Permits both archbishops and bishops travelling in dioceses not their own, to bless the people.

51. Relates to the condition in which benefices ought

to be left by those leaving them.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1717 and 2476. *Fleury.*

Avignon, 1337. AVIGNON. Held on the 3rd of September, 1337, by three archbishops and seventeen bishops. They published a decree containing sixty-nine articles, being chiefly a repetition of those drawn up in the preceding council. Amongst other things, it is enacted, that parishioners shall receive the eucharist at Easter only at the hands of their proper curate. By canon five, it is ordered, that incumbents and all persons in holy orders shall abstain from eating meat on Saturdays, in honour of the Virgin, that by so doing they may set a good example to the laity. This injunction to fast on Saturdays had been made three hundred years before, upon occasion of the "Treve de Dieu," but had not yet, it seems, been universally established; the other regulations of the council relate chiefly to the usurpations of Church property and acts of violence committed on the persons of the clergy.—*Gall. Christ.* Tom. i. p. 322. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1850.

Avignon, 1457. AVIGNON. Held on the 7th of September, 1457, by the cardinal Pierre de Foix, archbishop of Arles, and legate. The chief purpose of this council was to confirm the acts of that of Basle, relating to the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin. It was forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to preach any thing contrary to this doctrine, or to dispute concerning it in public. All curates were enjoined to make known this decree, that no one might plead ignorance.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1403.

Avignon, 1594. AVIGNON. Held in 1594, Francis Marin, archbishop of Avignon. Sixty-four canons were published, relating chiefly to the same subjects treated of in the synods held in various parts of France, &c., after the council of Trent. 8. Provides for teaching the rudiments of the faith to adults as well as children. 9. Orders sermons on all Sundays, and every day in Lent and Advent. 11—21. Of the sacraments. 14. Orders that the baptismal water be renewed only on holy Saturday and the eve of Whit-Sunday, unless need require; and that a silver vessel be used to pour it into the font. 25 and 26. Of relics and images. 28. Of behaviour in church. 44. Of Lent. 46. Of processions. 56. Of legacies, wills, &c. 57. Of medical men. 60. Against duelling. 62. Of Jews:

orders them to keep in their houses on Easter-eve and Easter-day.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1434.

AVRANCHES. [*Concilium Avrincatense.*] Held on the 22nd of May, 1172, the cardinal legates, Theodinus and Albert, presided. Henry the Second of England, having taken the oath which the pope's legates required of him, and annulled all the unlawful customs which had been established in his time, and done penance, was absolved on account of the assassination of Becket. Amongst other things, Henry engaged, 1st, not to withdraw from the obedience of the pope Alexander III. or of his successors, so long as they continued to acknowledge him as Catholic king of England. 2ndly, That he would not hinder appeals to Rome. 3rdly, He promised, at the coming Christmas, to take the cross for three years, and in the year following to set out for Jerusalem; unless the pope should grant a dispensation, and unless he was obliged to go to Spain to oppose the Saracens. Avranches, 1172.

This was rather an assembly than a council. The real council of Avranches, in this year, was not held until the 27th or 28th of September. The king then renewed his oath, adding to it some expressions of attachment and obedience to Alexander.

Twelve canons were then drawn up, enacting, amongst other matters, that it should not be lawful to appoint infants to benefices with cure of souls; that the incumbents of parishes, who could afford it, should be compelled to have an assisting priest; that it should not be lawful for a husband or wife to enter upon a monastic life whilst the other continued in the world. Abstinence and fasting during Advent were recommended to all who could bear it, and especially to the clergy.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1457.

B.

BADAM. See C. Habam, A.D. 1014. Badam, 1014.

BARCELONA. [*Concilium Barcinonense.*] Held November 1, 599, in the church of the Holy Cross, at which twelve bishops of the province of Tarragona were present, Asiaticus of Tarragona presiding; they drew up four canons, of which the first two relate to the crime of simony; the third forbids the elevation of a lay person to a bishopric, the king's mandate notwithstanding; the fourth condemns the marriage of Barcelona, 599.

virgins consecrated to the service of God, and of penitents of either sex.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1605.

Barcelona, 1068.

BARCELONA. Held in 1068, by the legate, cardinal Hugo the White. Raymond, count of the principality, being well-inclined to do away with the use of the Gothic office within his dominions, according to the wish of pope Alexander II., (being warmly urged to it by his wife, Adalmodis, a Frenchwoman,) Hugo called together this council, at which all the bishops and abbots of the principality were present. They agreed unanimously to exchange the use of the Gothic office for the Roman; and further decreed that, in future, the clergy should live in perpetual continence, and that they should not be married, as had hitherto been permitted.—*Pagi.*

Bari, 1097.

BARI. [*Concilium Barense.*] Held in October, 1097, by pope Urban II., at the head of one hundred and eighty-three bishops. Here, the question of the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches was discussed. Amongst other things, the Greeks, endeavouring to prove, from the Holy Scriptures, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father only, were answered by Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, who chanced to be present, and who showed so clearly the truth of his procession from the Father and the Son, that the council pronounced anathema against all who should deny it; at his entreaty, moreover, the sentence of excommunication against William Rufus, his persecutor, was delayed.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 611.

Basle, 1431.

BASLE. [*Concilium Basiliense.*] Held in the year 1431. This council was convoked by Martin V. to assemble at Pavia, thence transferred to Sienna, and afterwards from Sienna to Basle. Eugene IV., his successor, confirmed his injunction for the meeting of the council at Basle, and also the privilege which had been conferred upon the cardinal Julian of presiding at it. The two principal objects of this council were, first, the restoration of union between the Greek and Roman Churches; and, secondly, the general reformation of the Church, both in its head and in its members, according to the plan suggested in the council of Constance.

The council was opened on the 23rd of July. The bishops who attended were divided into four classes, each class was composed of cardinals, archbishops,

bishops, abbots, curates, and doctors, both secular and regular, as well in theology as in the canon law, taken indifferently from any nation or province; and in order that the numbers in each class might be kept the same, four persons were appointed, whose duty it was to distribute equally amongst them all new comers. Liberty was given to the classes to discuss the questions proposed to them, separately or together. They met in the chapter-house of the cathedral church, and there it was open to every member to say whatever he thought good upon the matter in debate, the conclusion which they arrived at being afterwards reported to the general council, which sat in the cathedral, and which passed the final judgment. As the Italian bishops were far more numerous than those from any other country, by a prudent regulation they were prevented from cabalting together, and so hindering or retarding, by their numbers, that Church reform which was a chief object of the council. In the

Basle, 1431.

First session, cardinal Julian delivered an address, in which he exhorted those present to lead a pure and holy life, to have charity one towards another, and to labour together for the good of the Church. Then the decree of the council of Constance, concerning the celebration of a general council after five and after seven years, was read, together with the bull of Martin V. convoking the council, in which he named Julian president, also the letter of Eugene IV. to the latter upon the subject, afterwards the six objects proposed in assembling the council were enumerated,—

I. Session. Dec. 7, 1431.

1. The extirpation of heresy.
2. The re-union of all Christian persons with the Catholic Church.
3. To afford instruction in the true faith.
4. To appease the wars between Christian princes.
5. To reform the Church in its head and in its members.
6. To re-establish, as far as possible, the ancient discipline of the Church.

In this session the decrees of Constance against those who should trouble the council by secret intrigues or open violence, were renewed. Lastly, they made a decree to the effect that the holy council of Basle was lawfully assembled, and that it was the duty of all prelates to attend it. In this session the notaries, pro-

Basle, 1432. moters, and other officers of the council, were appointed.

In the interval between the first and second sessions, as it appeared that the pope was doing his utmost to dissolve the council, measures were taken to prevent him. The French bishops, in an assembly at Bourges, represented to Charles VII., that the council was lawfully convoked to Basle, and entreated him to prevail upon the pope to permit the council to proceed, and to allow the prelates of his kingdom to attend, which was done according to their request.

II. Session. Feb. 15, 1432. In the second session, held February 15, 1432, the two decrees made in the fourth and fifth sessions of the council of Constance, were confirmed, and two new decrees enacted.

In the first it is declared, that the synod, being assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and representing the Church militant, derives its power directly from our Lord Jesus Christ, and that all persons, of whatever rank or dignity, not excepting the Roman pontiff himself, are bound to obey it [2] in all matters relating to the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the general reform of the Church, both in its chief and in its members.

In the second decree, the council declares that any person, of whatsoever rank or condition, not excepting the pope, who shall refuse to obey the laws and decrees of this or of any other general council, shall be put to penance and punished.

The occasion of this decree was the news that pope Eugene had issued a decree for the dissolution of the council, upon the pretext that the union of the Greek and Latin Churches required that the council should be delayed. Upon this subject cardinal Julian wrote two letters to Eugene, to induce him not to dissolve the council; in them he entirely refutes the pretence of the pope, that the council was not lawfully called; he shows him that no one could gainsay the authority of the council of Basle, without at the same time impugning that of the council of Constance, which no one questioned, for in that case the deposition of John the

[2] "Primo declarat quod ipsa synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata generale concilium faciens et Ecclesiam Militantem repræsentans, potestatem immediatè a Christo habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et extirpationem dicti schismatis et ad generalem reformationem Ecclesiæ Dei," &c.

Twenty-third would be uncanonical; and, consequently, all subsequent elections to the papal chair null and void, including, necessarily, his own. He further shows him, that he had no power to dissolve the council, it having been already determined in the council of Constance that the pope is subject to the decrees of a general council in all matters relating to the faith, the extinction of schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members; that, in consequence, the council being superior to the pope in these three cases, Eugene must submit to the council in the same. Basle, 1432.

The council, seconding the views of Julian, gave a synodal answer to the pope's legates, in which they lay down the same principles, and support them by solid arguments, thus:—First, that no person can dispute the authority of the Church; or that all that she receives ought to be received by all the faithful; or that she alone enjoys the privilege of infallibility; therefore she alone can make laws binding universally upon all the faithful. Secondly, that œcumenical councils have an authority equal to that of the Church itself; because they, in fact, represent the Catholic Church, which derives its power directly from our Lord Jesus Christ, as is expressly declared by the council of Constance; therefore œcumenical councils are infallible, since they are, in fact, the Church itself. Thirdly, that the pope, although the chief *minister* of the Church, *is not* above the whole *mystical body*, since the mystical body cannot err in matters of faith, whilst experience shows that the pope, albeit the head of the body, can err. Moreover, the Church, the mystical body, has on several occasions deposed popes when convicted of error in faith; whilst, on the contrary, no pope has ever pretended to excommunicate or condemn the Church as a body. These arguments had little effect upon Eugene, who persisted in his wish to dissolve the council, which, on its part, made it a duty to oppose its authority to that of the pope. Decrees were also published in the second session, forbidding to hinder in any way those coming to or present at the council; and forbidding those present to leave it without leave.

In the third session, April 29, it was enacted (amongst other things), that the council lawfully assembled, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and having all the authority of an œcumenical council, did warn, III. Session. April 29, 1432.

Basle, 1432.

entreat, implore, and require the pope Eugene to revoke, absolutely and entirely, the decree which he had executed for the dissolution of the said council; and to present himself at it within three months, his health permitting, or to send accredited persons who might act in his name. In case he should neglect to comply with this requisition, the council further declared, that they would proceed to take measures for the welfare of the Church according as the Holy Spirit should dictate to them.

IV. Session, June 20, 1432.

In the fourth session, June 20, a safe conduct was granted to such Bohemians as should be sent to the council, the council guaranteeing the safety of as many under two hundred as chose to attend. A letter was also written to congratulate them upon the resolution they had formed in the city of Ægra to send deputies to the council, which gave reason to hope for a speedy re-union. As the pope Eugene was then sick, the council made a decree to the effect, that, in the event of a vacancy in the holy see, the cardinals should not proceed to the election anywhere save in the council itself; and, further, that during the sitting of the council, the pope should not be permitted to advance any one to the rank of cardinal, the number of these being already a burden upon the Church; that should he do so, notwithstanding this decree, the election should be considered null and void. Also, that no person should be excused from attending the council upon the plea of an oath or promise made to the pope, all such oaths and promises being declared to be not binding.

V. Session, August 9, 1432.

In the fifth session, August 9, three judges were appointed for the examination of questions relating to the faith, prior to the final judgment of the council, and three other bishops to take cognizance of all other matters brought before the council, not being matters of faith. In the interval, between the fifth and sixth sessions, two congregations were held, in which audience was given to the four legates of the pope Eugene. The bishop of Tarentum magnified the authority of the pope, pretending that he alone possessed the right to appoint the time, place, and celebration of councils, and offering any place within the states of the Church that they might choose. The council, in reply, stated, that to wish to dissolve a council lawfully called, was, in fact, to desire to renew a schism in the Church; that those

who acted so grieved the Holy Spirit, and drove Him from their own heart, in breaking the only bond which can retain Him, viz. charity. Basle, 1432.

In the sixth session, September 6, as the pope had neither revoked the bull for the dissolution of the council, nor appeared in person nor by deputy, the promoters of the council required that he should be formally declared contumacious; after that the citation had been three times made at the door of the cathedral. VI. Session. Sept. 6, 1432.

In the seventh session, November 6, the former decree of the council, made in the fourth session, concerning an election to the popedom in case of a vacancy, which enacted, that it should not be lawful for the cardinals to proceed to the election of a pope without the consent of the council, was renewed. VII. Session. Nov. 6, 1432.

In the eighth session, December 18, it was agreed that the pope should be proceeded against canonically, in order to declare him contumacious, and to visit him with the canonical penalty; two months' delay, however, being granted him within which to revoke his bull for the dissolution, but if at the end of that period he should still remain contumacious, that he should be at once proceeded against without further citation. A decree was made by which the council declared, that since the holy Catholic Church is one, (that being an article of faith,) it is impossible that there can be, at *the same time*, more than *one* œcumenical council representing the holy Catholic Church; and, accordingly, that whilst the council continued its sitting at Basle, it was impossible that another should assemble elsewhere; that any such pretended council would be a schismatical assembly, and all persons present at it, *ipso facto*, excommunicated; and, if incumbents, deprived of their benefices. VIII. Sess. Dec. 18, 1432.

The deputies[3] being now arrived from the Bohemians, they presented to the council on the 16th January, 1433, four articles, by which they demanded,—First, the liberty to administer the holy Eucharist to all the faithful in both kinds. Secondly, that all mortal sin, and especially open sin, should be repressed, corrected, and punished, according to God's law, by those to whom it

[3] Rokyzana, Wenceslaus, Uldaric, and Peter Payne, an Englishman, who each spoke at great length upon one article.

Basle, 1433.

belonged to do so. Thirdly, that the Word of God should be preached faithfully and freely by the bishops and by such deacons as were fit for it. Fourthly, that it should not be permitted to the clergy to possess authority in temporal matters.

In these four points, they declared, were comprised all in which they differed from their Catholic brethren; and that if their wishes were so far acceded to, they were ready to return into union with the Church, and to obey their lawful superiors. These four articles having been examined in a congregation, it was decided to send deputies into Bohemia[4].

IX. Session. Jan. 22. 1433.

In the ninth session, January 22, 1433, the council, in order to testify their satisfaction at the conduct of the emperor Sigismund, who, by his letters-patent, had declared to all his subjects that the holy council of Basle was under his protection, and that he would not permit its authority to be in any manner impugned, declared, that whatever the pope might do against him should be considered null and void.

X. Session, Feb. 19, 1433.

In the tenth session, February 19, the promoters of the council required that pope Eugene should be declared contumacious, on account of his obstinacy, in not revoking the bull for the dissolution of the council. Some time was consumed in deliberating upon this point; fresh endeavours were made to persuade Eugene to concede, and the emperor united his entreaties to those of Julian. Other princes, amongst whom was the king of France, gave public tokens of their resolution to protect the council.

XI. Session, April 27, 1433.

In the eleventh session, April 27, it was resolved, that if the pope should neglect to convoke a council every ten years, according to the decree made in the thirty-ninth session of the council of Constance, the

[4] Subsequently a Formulary of Concord was published upon the matter of the Bohemians, in which permission was given to the clergy in Bohemia and Moravia to administer the cup to those amongst the laity who desired it. . . . . "Sacrum concilium sacerdotibus dictorum regni et marchionatûs communicandi sub utraque specie populum, eas videlicet personas quæ in annis discretionis constitutæ reverenter et devote postulaverint, facultatem in Domino pro eorum utilitate et salute largietur; hoc semper observato, quod sacerdotes sic communicantibus semper dicant quod ipsi debeant firmiter credere quod non sub specie panis Caro tantum, nec sub specie vini Sanguis tantum, sed sub qualibet specie est integer et totus Christus. . . ."

right of calling the council should devolve upon the bishops, without any obligation to demand permission of the pope. It was also declared, that the absolute prohibition to prorogue a council signified in these words—"nullatenus prorogetur," by the council of Constance, was binding upon the pope, and that, consequently, a council once assembled could neither be prorogued, transferred, nor interrupted by the pope, unless two-thirds of the fathers composing it should consent. Basle, 1433.

Eugene, however, was now willing to send legates to the council to preside at it in his name, but the council refused to admit them; because, as they stated, the pope had given to them such unlimited powers, that if they should think fit to object to any conclusion or enactment of the council, it would be thereby rendered null and void; whereas, the council maintained that not only the presidents but the pope himself was subject to the council. Besides, they maintained, the legates came rather to hold a new council than to confirm that which was actually sitting; since Eugene had refused to recognize it from the time of its assembling at Basle.

In the twelfth session, July 14, complaint was made of the bad faith of the pope, whose conduct tended to lower the authority of councils; by a decree, he was required to renounce within sixty days his design of transferring the council from Basle, upon pain of being pronounced contumacious. The election of prelates was declared to be free, as established by the holy apostles, and confirmed by the first council of Nicea; in consequence the pope was forbidden to reserve to himself the reversion to any ecclesiastical preferments beyond those which are contained in the rights of the Roman see, or which are situated in the lands dependent upon the Church of Rome; seeing that by reason of the vast increase of these reservations[5] every day the right of XII. Sess. July 14, 1433.

[5] [Electiones expectandæ.] A "reservation," properly speaking, was a declaration by which the pope reserved to himself the right of presenting to such a cathedral, or to such a dignity or benefice, when it should fall vacant, with prohibition to the chapter to proceed to elect, and to the ordinary to consecrate. These reservations were accompanied with bad consequences; and it often happened that those to whom the promise of such reversions had been given, tired of waiting for the natural demise of the incumbents, found some means of putting an end to them; or if they did not proceed to this extremity, nourished a secret

Basle, 1433.

election was in a fair way of being in the end annihilated. The same decree enjoins those to whom the privilege of electing belongs to make choice of fit persons, viz. persons of mature age, of good report, and already in holy orders. It further forbids all simoniacal elections, pronounces them absolutely void, and deprives of the right of voting at any future election those who have been guilty of such practices. It, moreover, exhorts princes to abstain from all interference in elections, and to do nothing to bar their freedom.

The pope Eugene, irritated by these proceedings on the part of the council, issued a bull, annulling all their decrees against himself, and especially the first of this session.

XIII. Sess. Sept. 11, 1433.

In the thirteenth session, September 11, the promoters of the council demanded that Eugene should be declared contumacious, the two months' grace granted to him having expired; however, at the solicitation of the duke of Bavaria in the name of the emperor, the term was extended thirty days.

XIV. Sess. Nov. 6, 1433.

In the fourteenth session, November 6, the emperor Sigismund was present in person: a new delay of three months was granted to the pope, on condition that he would within that time give in his adherence to the council, and revoke everything that he had done either for its dissolution or transfer, as well as against the decree of the twelfth session, and that by a distinct and unequivocal act, of which they drew up three forms for his use.

XV. Sess. Nov. 25, 1433.

In the fifteenth session, November 25, the emperor was again present: various rules for the convocation of diocesan councils were drawn up; amongst others it was ruled that they should be assembled twice, or at the least once, in each year; that all present at them should be exhorted to lead a life suited to the holiness of their calling, to instruct the people on every Sunday and festival; to read the canons concerning the due administration of the sacraments, and to inform themselves concerning the lives and conduct of their clergy.

The pope Eugene having, at the earnest solicitation of the emperor, promised to unite with the council, upon condition that they would revoke all their past

wish for their death. The council of Lateran, in 1179, forbad generally this anticipation of vacancies. This prohibition was also inserted in the Pragmatic Sanction and in the Concordat.

acts against him, they were, on their part, anxious to make the most of his improved feeling towards them; accordingly, the ambassadors of the king of France and of the duke of Burgundy, were sent to him to conclude the terms of accommodation which had been proposed. In the end, the pope chose four cardinals to preside with Julian at the council; he revoked all the bulls which he had issued for its dissolution, and published one according to the form sent him by the council. [Session xiv.] It was to the effect, that, although he had broken up the council of Basle lawfully assembled, nevertheless, in order to appease the disorders which had arisen, he declared the council to have been lawfully continued from its commencement, and that it would be so to the end; that he approved of all that it had ordered and decided, and that he declared the bull for its dissolution, which he had issued, to be null and void; thus, as M. Bossuet observes, setting the council above himself, since, in obedience to its order, he revoked his own decree, made with all the authority of his see. Basle, 1433.

In the sixteenth session, Feb. 5, 1434, the letters of Eugene approving of the council and revoking the dissolution which he had decreed, were read, the emperor Sigismund being present. On the 24th of April, a congregation was held for the sake of incorporating the pope's legates with the council. XVI. Sess. Feb. 5, 1434.

In the seventeenth session, April 26, the legates were made to swear that they would labour faithfully to advance the honour of the council, and that they would observe all the decrees of the council of Constance, especially those of the fourth and fifth sessions; it was further declared that they should not be permitted to preside, except upon the condition that they would admit their authority to be derived *solely* from the council, "without any co-active jurisdiction," and would bind themselves to give their conclusions in strict conformity with the decisions of the council; and a decree was made to the effect, that in case the legates should refuse to pronounce what had been agreed upon by the council[6], the right of *making the declaration* should devolve upon the bishop who should sit next to them; for this reason, that the laws passed in a general council XVII. Sess. April 26, 1434.

[6] "Pronuntiare concilii sanctionem."

Basle, 1434. derive their authority solely from the council itself, and that the right to preside and to pronounce the judgment of the council, which the legates of the pope asserted, is but honorary.

Alexander, in his eighth dissertation upon the council of Basle, remarks, concerning this subject, that although the pope has greater authority than any one else in the council, presiding in person or by his legates, explaining its decrees, ordering their execution, &c., yet it by no means follows that the authority of an œcumenical council is so dependent upon him, that he can at will change or annul its decrees; that his authority has no force without the concurrence of all the other members of the council, and that the binding authority of the resolutions made in council by no means arises from the authority of the Roman pontiff, but depends solely upon the unanimous consent of the fathers present, the pope himself included. This is allowed by the pope S. Leo in his letter to the fathers of the council of Chalcedon, as cardinal Cuza remarks in his third book, De Concord. Cath. c. 5.

XVIII. Sess. June 27, 1434. In the eighteenth session, June 27, the emperor was not present, having left Basle. The fourth and fifth canons of Constance were renewed. John, patriarch of Antioch, laid a paper before the council, tending to establish the authority of œcumenical councils and their superiority over the popes.

XIX. Sess. Sept. 7, 1434. In the nineteenth session, Sept. 7, the Greek ambassadors, whom the emperor John Paleologus had sent, were present[7]. Several matters in which they were concerned were discussed; various means were proposed to facilitate the holding a council of the two churches. It was determined to send legates to Constantinople, in order to induce the Greeks to agree to the city of Basle as the place of meeting, and to offer them money and four large ships to enable them to come there; and, moreover, two more armed ships for the defence of Constantinople against the Turks during the emperor's absence. Also, a decree was made in which all ordinaries were exhorted to send fit persons to preach the word of God amongst the Jews and infidels, and that for this purpose there should be ap-

[7] These were Demetrius, Palæologus Mæotides, Isidorus (abbot of the monastery of S. Demetrius), and Joannes Dissipatus.

pointed in all universities two professors of the Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, and Chaldee languages. Basle, 1435.

In the twentieth session, Jan. 22, 1435, the subject under consideration was the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members. A decree was directed against the incontinence of the clergy, viz. against those who were living openly in a state of concubinage, to the effect that such, upon conviction, should lose the fruits of their benefices for three months; should they refuse to obey, they were to be declared incapable of holding any benefice in future; should they relapse after having been restored, and after having given tokens of amendment, they were to be declared incapable of holding any ecclesiastical dignity, without hope of the sentence being revoked. The second decree referred to the case of excommunicated persons, and declared that no one, whoever he might be, should be shunned as excommunicated, even in the administration of the sacraments, on account of any *general* sentence or censure, but only when the sentence was directed against him individually, pronounced by a competent judge, and specially notified to him. XX. Sess. Jan. 22, 1435.

In the twenty-first session, June 9, a decree was made against the annates or first-fruits, the origin of which dates no further back than the time of Clement V. The council declared that, as far as the court of Rome is concerned, in the confirmation of elections, in all grants, collations, and presentations made by the laity, in investitures to all cathedral churches, and other dignities and benefices, no sort of remuneration whatever should be made on account of bulls, seals, or common first-fruits, notwithstanding any custom or privilege to the contrary whatsoever. In a word, the council absolutely forbad the payment of first-fruits under pain of incurring the penalties of simony; and it added, further, this clause, that if, (which God forbid!) the Roman pontiff, who ought to set an example to all others of obedience to the decrees of œcumenical councils, should offend the Church by doing any thing contrary to this present ordinance, he should be brought before a general council [8]. XXI. Sess. June 9, 1435.

The pope remonstrated with the council on this sub-

[8] It may be remarked of this decree, that it was made at a time when the council was œcumenical, even according to the acknowledgment of those who were most opposed to it.

Basle, 1436.

ject, and declared that he was willing to abolish the first-fruits, if the council would bind itself to provide for the necessities of the holy see. To this the cardinal Julian answered, that in the primitive ages of the Church the popes abounded in works of charity without receiving any such revenue as the first-fruits; that the council would provide for the wants of the holy see, if the pope, on his part, would observe the decrees of the council; that the intention of the decree against first-fruits was simply to put an end to simony. The third decree related to "*Pacificis possessionibus*," and enacts that those who have been in peaceable possession of a benefice for three years, having been inducted upon a lawful title, may not be disturbed in their possession. The fourth decree related to the celebration of divine service. It was ordered that service should be said at suitable and convenient hours; that notice should be given beforehand by the tolling of a bell; that the service should be chanted gravely and decorously, with proper pauses, &c.; that all persons should stand during the Gloria Patri, and should bow at the sacred name of Jesus. Several other decrees upon the same subjects were made.

XXII. Sess. Oct. 15, 1435.

In the twenty-second session, Oct. 15, a book written by a Roman monk of the order of S. Augustin was condemned for containing certain propositions, which attributed to the human nature of our Lord what rightly belongs only to the Divine nature.

XXIII. Sess. March 25, 1436.

In the twenty-third session, March 25, 1436, several regulations were made relating to the election and the profession of faith of the sovereign pontiff. The council then, in order to put into execution the acts of the council of Constance relating to the cardinals, proceeded to reduce their numbers to twenty-four; it also regulated the manner of their election, in order to secure its freedom. It declared to be null and void all promises of reversions to ecclesiastical preferments, mandates and reservations of benefices, made by the popes for their own profit. All these decrees were made in proper canonical form, and declared in open council.

XXIV. Sess. April 14, 1436.

In the twenty-fourth session, April 14, the legates of the pope urged the council, on the part of Eugene, to make selection, as soon as it could be done, of some other place in which to assemble, promising on his part sixty thousand crowns to defray the expenses of the

emperor of the Greeks and his suite, if they would make choice of a place which he could approve. They also complained bitterly of the decrees concerning elections and first-fruits. In answer to these complaints it was stated that all had been done in order. Basle, 1437.

Between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions a congregation was held, at which as many as three hundred and fifty-seven prelates were present (as Panormus declares in his history of the council), of whom many more than two-thirds signified their opinion that the council should continue at Basle, if such a course would be pleasing to the Greeks, but that if not, they should endeavour to make them consent to Avignon, or, as a last resource, have recourse to Savoy, which was one of the places which the Greeks themselves had named. In consequence of this determination, the council sent two deputies to pope Eugene to entreat him earnestly to concur with them in the great work they had at heart, viz. the reunion of the Greek and Roman Churches. The deputies, upon their arrival at Rome, besought the pope to go in person to the council.

The legates of the pope, on the other side, used all their endeavours to sow dissensions amongst the fathers of the council, and to induce the majority to demand that the council for considering the matter of a re-union should be holden at Florence, or at Modena, or at some other city in Italy in which the pope was all-powerful; they had, however, no success, for although they gained over a few, more than two-thirds of those assembled held to the original decree.

In the twenty-fifth session, May 7, 1437, a decree was drawn up enacting that the œcumenical[9] council, for considering the matter of the re-union of the Greek and Roman Churches, should be held either at Basle or at Avignon; and that all ecclesiastics should pay a tenth of their revenue to defray the needful expences attending the holding of the council. It is undoubtedly true, that Basle was too far distant from the Greeks; but the fathers of the council, who had little faith in the pope, XXV. Sess. May 7, 1437.

[9] During these discussions the Greek legates, being questioned as to what they understood by the words "concilium universale," answered, "Quod papa et patriarchæ sint in dicta synodo per se vel procuratores suos similiter, et alii prælati sint ibidem verè vel representativè."

Basle, 1437.

feared lest Eugene, under pretence of transferring, should endeavour a second time to dissolve it, or at least remove it to some place in which all liberty of deliberation would be taken away from them; they offered to consent to the transfer of the council from Basle to Avignon, or to some city in Savoy, because in that case they would have had the protection of France, which was favourable to them, and close at hand. Such was the ground of all the disputes between the pope and the council.

In this session two opinions divided the members of the council; one party, and that by far the most numerous, was for holding the council at Avignon, the other for transferring it to Florence: and, although in a minority, they, in concert with the pope's legates, made a decree in the name of the council removing it to that city. Immediately Eugene confirmed this decree by a bull which transferred the council to Ferrara, and in order to prevent them from continuing to sit at Basle, he fitted out some galleys at Venice in opposition to those which the council were about to send in order to convey the Greeks. The Greek ambassadors embarking in these vessels, with three legates, whom the pope sent into the East, arrived at Constantinople before the deputies from the council; and in consequence, when the galleys of the council shortly after came, the emperor of the Greeks refused to embark in them. The fathers at Basle, being informed of this conduct on the part of Eugene, resolved to oppose him with their whole power. The cardinal Julian, however, withdrew from it in consequence of their refusal to follow his advice, which was to send legates to meet the Greeks who had arrived at Venice, and to endeavour to bring them to Basle.

XXVI. Sess. July 31, 1437.

In the twenty-sixth session, July 31, the council published a decree, in which, after enumerating all that they had done during six years for the reformation of the Church, and which Eugene had done all in his power to thwart, they summoned him to appear before them, either in person or by deputy, within sixty days. Eugene, however, far from submitting to the will of the council, published a bull for its translation or dissolution, forbidding the enactment of any synodal act within that city under the heaviest penalties after the expiration of thirty days, which time was to be employed in treating

with the Bohemian ambassadors who were present at the council. At the same time, he summoned a council to Ferrara, to which he invited the whole of Christendom: this convocation was ill received in France, and the king, Charles VII., forbad the French bishops to attend. Basle, 1438.

In the twenty-seventh session, Sept. 26, the creation of two cardinals by the pope, without the consent of the council, was declared to be null and void. XXVII. Sess. Sept. 26, 1437.

In the twenty-eighth session, Oct. 1, the sixty days given to the pope in which to appear before the council having expired without any one appearing in his behalf, he was declared contumacious, and it was resolved that he should be proceeded against. XXVIII. Sess. Oct. 1, 1437.

In the twenty-ninth session, Oct. 12, the bull of the pope for the transfer of the council to Ferrara was refuted by strong arguments. It was shown that the city of Avignon was convenient for the reception of the Greeks, being near the sea, and moreover had been agreed to already both by the Greeks and Eugene, who had himself approved of fitting out galleys at Avignon, which should wait for the Greeks there, but had, nevertheless, without consulting the council, sent other galleys to Constantinople to anticipate those of the council; that this division could only serve to scandalise the Greeks and to foment the schism. XXIX. Sess. Oct. 12, 1437.

It was after this session that the pope held his council at Ferrara; and that cardinal Julian, according to some, left this council.

In the thirtieth session, Dec. 23, a decree was made upon the subject of the communion in both kinds; it was declared that none of the faithful (not being priests) are bound by any Divine precept to receive the holy sacrament of the eucharist under both kinds; that it may not be doubted that Jesus Christ is entire under each kind, and that the custom of granting to the laity the communion in one kind only is to be considered as a law, which no one may condemn or alter without the Church's sanction. XXX. Sess. Dec. 23, 1437.

In the thirty-first session, Jan. 24, 1438, two decrees were made, one enacting that all causes ecclesiastical should be terminated on the spot, and forbidding an appeal to the pope, to the exclusion of the ordinary. The second revokes all promises of reversions to ecclesiastical preferments, either already given, or which XXXI. Sess. Jan. 24, 1438.

Basle, 1439.

might be given in future, permitting the pope to appoint to one benefice in churches where there are ten prebends, and to two in churches having fifty: it also enacts that there shall be a theological professor in every cathedral church, who shall be a canon either B.D. or D.D., having studied for ten years in some privileged university; that in every cathedral or collegiate church the third part of the prebends shall be given to graduates, either doctors, or licentiates, or bachelors in some faculty; that the curates of walled towns must have proceeded to the degree of M.A. at least; and that the benefices of regulars shall be given to regulars.

Further, the council declared the pope Eugene contumacious, suspended him from the exercise of all jurisdiction either temporal or spiritual, and pronounced all that he should do to be null and void.

At this time the cardinal of Arles presided[1].

XXXII. Sess. March 29, 1438.

In the thirty-second session, March 29, the council denounced the assembly at Ferrara as schismatical and not worthy to be called a council. At the same time, they annulled all that had been done there, and excommunicated Eugene and all who attended it. They drew up eight articles against Eugene, which declare that it is a Catholic verity that a general council is superior to a pope, and that it cannot be transferred or dissolved but with its own consent.

XXXIII. Sess. May 16, 1439.

In the thirty-third session, May 16, 1439, only about twenty bishops or abbots were present, a great number of prelates having by degrees withdrawn from the council; their places, however, were supplied by their deputies—archdeacons, priors, doctors, &c., to the number of four hundred. They established by a decree, and as articles of faith, these three propositions: 1. That it is a Catholic verity that a general council has authority over the pope as well as all others. 2. That a general council, lawfully called, can neither be dissolved, nor transferred, nor prorogued by the pope's authority without the consent of the council itself. 3. That whosoever shall obstinately resist these verities is to be regarded as a heretic.

A general congregation was then held, in which they

[1] It is worthy of remark that this cardinal, who presided over the council after cardinal Julian had withdrawn, and during the period when it is considered by the Ultra-montanes as schismatical, was subsequently *canonized*.

took measures for deposing the pope. In this year Panormus, archbishop of Palermo, and the most noted canonist of his time, composed his treatise concerning the authority of the council of Basle; in which he endeavours to show, 1st, that the council was truly an œcumenical council; 2ndly, that it possessed the power of citing Eugene, and of proceeding against him; 3rdly, that the council had done nothing against him but what was just. Afterwards, however, he showed himself to be not a little changeable in his opinions, at one time favouring, at another deciding against Eugene. Basle, 1439.

In the thirty-fourth session, June 25, thirty-nine prelates were present, and three hundred ecclesiastics of the second order. Eugene was cited a second time, and declared to be contumacious: then they pronounced sentence of deposition against him, making use of the strongest possible terms. France, England, and Germany disapproved of this sentence. XXXIV. Sess. June 25, 1439.

In the thirty-fifth session, July 2, it was debated whether they should proceed at once to the election of a new pope, and it was finally resolved that they should wait for two months. XXXV. Sess. July 2, 1439.

In the thirty-sixth session, Sept. 17, a decree was made, by which the opinion of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin was declared to be a pious opinion, agreeable to the worship of the Church, to the Catholic faith, and to right reason; and it was ordered that the festival of the Conception should be celebrated on the 8th of December. The fathers of the council then drew up an apology for their conduct, in answer to a decree which Eugene had directed against them. XXXVI. Sess. Sept. 17. 1439.

In the thirty-seventh session, Oct. 24, it was resolved that the election of the future pope should take place in the council, and not elsewhere; that it should be made by the cardinal of Arles and thirty-two prelates; and that it should be no election if two-thirds of them did not agree. XXXVII. Sess. Oct. 24, 1439.

In the thirty-eighth session, Oct. 30, the officers of the conclave were appointed; and on the 5th of November they elected Amedeus, duke of Savoy, who was then in retirement in his solitude at Ripaille with his hermits. XXXVIII. Sess. Oct. 30, 1439.

In the thirty-ninth session, Nov. 17, twenty-five deputies were sent to Amedeus to beg of him to consent to his election, which, with great unwillingness, he at XXXIX. Sess. Nov. 17. 1439.

Basle, 1440. last did, and took the name of Felix V. The council then ordered that he should be recognised as the pope by all the faithful.

XL. Sess. Feb. 26 1440. In the fortieth session, Feb. 26, 1440, the election of Amedeus was confirmed, and sentence of excommunication pronounced against all those who should refuse to recognise him.

XLI. Sess. July 23, 1440. In the forty-first session, July 23, the sentence of Eugene, declaring Felix and his party to be heretics, was condemned. On the day after this session Felix came in state to the council, and was there consecrated bishop by the cardinal of Arles, and crowned pope with great solemnity. He gave his benediction to the people, and granted indulgences.

XLII. Sess. Aug. 4. 1440. As Felix had no revenue wherewith to support his dignity, Eugene being in possession of the patrimony of S. Peter, it was permitted him, by a decree of the forty-second session, held Aug. 4, to exact, for the first five years of his pontificate, the fifth part of the revenue of all benefices, and during the five following the tenth part; and the members of the council endeavoured all in their power to cause the secular princes to recognise him.

Alphonso, king of Arragon, the queen of Hungary, and the dukes of Bavaria and Austria, amongst the European princes, recognised Felix, as also did the universities of Germany, Paris, and Cracow; but France, England, and Scotland, whilst they acknowledged the authority of the council of Basle, continued to recognise Eugene as the lawful pope.

XLIII. Sess. July 1, 1441. In the forty-third session, July 1, 1441, a decree was drawn up concerning the observance of the festival of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, but no mention was made of Felix in it, owing to his not having been recognised as pope by several princes.

XLIV. Sess. Aug. 9, 1441. In the forty-fourth session, Aug. 9, a regulation was made providing for the security of the acts of the council, and of the persons who composed it.

XLV. Sess. May 16, 1443. In the forty-fifth and last session, held on May 16, 1443, it was determined that a general council should be held in the city of Lyons at the end of three years, to be a continuation of that of Basle.

The council of Basle lasted twelve years, i. e. from the 19th of May, 1431, to the same month, 1443. This council is regarded as œcumenical by the Gallican

Church to the end of the twenty-fifth session: the Ultramontanes reject it altogether. And never having been recognised by the eastern churches, it evidently has not the slightest ground to be considered as *œcumenical.* Pope Eugene dying four years after, Nicholas V. was elected in his stead, and recognised by the whole church, whereupon Felix V. renounced the pontificate in 1449, and thus the schism ended.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 442—1429.

Beauvais. 845.

BEAUVAIS. [*Concilium Bellovacense.*] Held in April, 845. Ten bishops were present. Hincmar was here elected to the archbishopric of Rheims, which had been vacant ten years. A sort of agreement (consisting of eight articles) was drawn up between Hincmar and Charles, the king, which the latter promised to observe religiously.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1811.

Beauvais, 1114.

BEAUVAIS. Held December 6, 1114, by Conon, legate and cardinal, assisted by the bishops of three provinces. Here, sentence of excommunication was passed upon the emperor, Henry V., and Thomas Seigneur de Marle, accused of cruelty and robbery. Several decrees made by the later popes, for the preservation of Church property, and others relating to discipline, called for by the circumstances of the times, were renewed; also the case of certain heretics was discussed, whom the populace had burned at Soissons, without waiting for the sentence of the ecclesiastical court, fearing that it would be too lenient. The case of Godfrey, who had left his bishopric of Amiens, and retired to the monastery of Chartreuse, was deferred for consideration at a future council [2].—Tom. x. Conc. p. 797.

Beauvais, 1120.

BEAUVAIS. Held in October, 1120, by the legate

[2] In the council letters from Godfrey were read, in which he alleged that he was weak, and altogether unfit for the episcopal office; and that, although he had taught his people in *word,* he felt that he had done much to corrupt and ruin them by his example. At the reading of these words all present were melted into tears, wondering at and admiring the extraordinary humility of the man. In the following year, in the synod of Soissons, Henry, abbot of St. Quentin, and Hubert, monk of Clugny, were sent to the monastery of Chartreuse, to bring back Godfrey to his see. When they arrived and declared their purpose, he threw himself at the feet of the Carthusians, imploring them not to suffer him to be taken from them; but unable to resist the united power of the king and the bishops, they dismissed him in peace.

Conon and the bishops of three provinces. At this council, the canonization of Arnulphus, bishop of Soissons, took place. The then bishop of Soissons holding in his hand the book containing the life of Arnulphus, certified to the bishops present the truth of every thing contained in it, and entreated them to examine it themselves, adding, "As for me, if it were in my power, and if it were in my diocese, his body should long ago have been taken out of the earth." These words show that one of the forms of canonization in practice at that time, was to disinter the body of the saint. The day was then settled, with the abbot of Oudenbourg, on which the body of Arnulphus, which was buried in his monastery, should be raised from the ground, and this was accordingly done, on the 1st of May in the year following.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 882.

Beccanceld, 692. BECCANCELD. [*Concilium Becanceldense.*] Held in 692, by Wihtred, king of Kent, at Beccanceld, in Kent, (probably Bapchild, near Sittingbourn.) Besides the king, there were present, Brihtwald, archbishop of Canterbury, Tobias of Rochester, and several abbots, abbesses, and "wise men." The chief object of the council appears to have been to consult about the repairing of the churches in Kent, injured in the wars with the West Saxons.

King Wihtred then, with his own mouth, renewed and confirmed the liberties, and privileges, and possessions of the Church in his kingdom[3], forbidding all future kings, and all aldermen, and laymen, for ever, all dominion over the churches, and all things belonging to them. He further directed that, upon the death of any bishop, abbot, or abbess, the event should be immediately made known to the archbishop, and a worthy successor be chosen with his consent.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canons.* Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1356.

Beccanceld, 796. (A.D. 798, *Wilkins.*) BECCANCELD. Held about 796, by Athelard, archbishop of Canterbury, in which the privileges granted to the churches by Wihtred and others were solemnly confirmed. This deed of confirmation is

[3] "It would be well if all earthly rulers would ever bear in mind the words of this king of Kent: 'It is a horrible thing,' he said, 'for men to rob the living God, and to divide his raiment and portion among themselves;' and many strong denunciations are added against those of his successors who may neglect this truth."—*Wilkins, Concilia*, vol. i. p. 57.

signed by the archbishop, twelve bishops, and twenty-three abbots.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canons.* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1148. *Wilkin's Conc.* vol. i. p. 162.

Beneventum, 1087.

BENEVENTUM. [*Concilium Beneventanum*]. Held in August, 1087, by Victor III., in which the anti-pope Guibert was deposed and anathematized; also Hugo of Lyons, and Richard, abbot of Marseilles, excommunicated, having refused to communicate with Victor. He thus expresses himself in the sentence: "We, therefore, with apostolical authority, command that you are careful to abstain from all communication whatever with them, since they, of their own act and deed, have deprived themselves of communion with the Church of Rome; for as the blessed Ambrose writes, 'Whosoever shall separate himself from the Church of Rome is to be treated as a heretic.'"

He also, with the unanimous consent of the council, forbad investitures, and decreed that if any one should accept of a bishopric or abbey at the hand of any lay person, he should in no way be regarded as bishop, or abbot, and should be excluded from the communion of the Roman Church; and in like manner, any emperor, king, duke, prince, count, &c., so giving any preferment, should be excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 418.

Beneventum, 1091.

BENEVENTUM. Held in 1091, under Urban II., in which many bishops and abbots are said to have been present, and the sentence of anathema against Guibert was renewed, and four canons drawn up, one of which forbids the election of any one to a bishopric who is not in holy orders.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 484.

Bergham-sted, 696.

BERGHAMSTED[4]. (*Concilium Berghamstedense.*] Held in 696, by Wihtred, king of Kent, who attended in person; there were also present, Brihtwald, "chief bishop of Britain," and Tobias of Rochester, together with some of every order in the Church, and many laymen. Twenty-eight laws, called the "Dooms of king Wihtred," were published:

1. Declares the Church to be free from taxes.

2. Inflicts a fine of fifty shillings for a breach of the protection of the Church or king.

3, and the three following, relate to sins of uncleanness.

7. Suspends from his ministration a priest guilty of

[4] Probably Bursted or Bearsted, near Maidstone.—*Johnson.*

conniving at fornication, neglecting to baptize the infirm, or of being drunk.

10. Fines the master eighty shillings, who shall make his slave work after sunset on Sunday till sunset on Monday[5].

11 and 12. Enact penalties against slaves and free servants who work on the Lord's day.

13 and 14. Enact penalties against those who make offerings to devils.

15. Declares, that if a man give flesh to his slave to eat on a fast-day, the slave shall be free.

17. Declares the word of the bishop and of the king to be valid without an oath.

18. Orders the heads of monasteries, priests, and deacons, to purge themselves on their own veracity, by saying before the altar, in their holy vestments, "I say the truth in Christ; I lie not."

19—24. Relate to different cases of purgation.

28. Orders that a stranger, who leaves the road, and does not scream, or blow a horn, shall be considered as a thief.—*Johnson. Ecc. Canon. Wilkins*, vol. i. p. 60. Tom. vi. p. 1576.

Besiers, 1234.

BESIERS. [*Concilium Biterrense.*] Held April 2, 1234, under the legate, John de Burnin, archbishop of Vienne. Twenty-six canons were drawn up against the heretics, very similar to those which Raymond, count of Toulouse, had published there on the 18th of February, in the same year[6]. Every individual was enjoined, if opportunity offered, to seize upon the heretics, and to bring them before the bishop. Every curé was directed to keep a list of all persons in his parish suspected of heresy, and strictly to enforce the laws against those who should neglect to attend their church on festival days, upon pain of losing his benefice. The council further desired that the life, morals, and learning of those to be ordained should be carefully examined into; and, moreover, that they should have a patrimonial title of at least a hundred sols tournois (about fifty livres). Other of the canons relate to the dress and lives of the regulars. 23. For-

[5] By "Sunday evening" and "Monday evening" are meant here what we now call Saturday evening and Sunday evening; and this according to the scriptural account, "And the *evening* and the *morning* were the first day."

[6] See Tom. xi. Conc. p. 449.

bids to sell wine in the monasteries, or to introduce there players, and joculators, and whores. 22 and 24. Forbid to present laymen to benefices and prebends. *Fleury*. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 452.

Besiers, 1246. (1255.—*Ruyn.*)

BESIERS. Held on the 29th of April, 1246, by William de la Brone, archbishop of Narbonne, and eight other bishops. It was in this council that the Preaching Friars' Inquisition for the provinces of Arles, Aix, and Embrun, and established by order of the pope, demanded of the bishops advice concerning the mode of carrying their commission into effect. This occasioned a long regulation, containing thirty-seven articles, which, together with those of Narbonne in 1235, are the foundation of the course of proceeding observed since in the tribunals of the inquisition. Amongst other instructions, the brotherhood are directed as follows: "You will order all those who are conscious of the guilt of heresy, or who are aware of it in others, to appear before you in order to declare the truth, within a certain time, to be called the period of grace. They who obey this mandate will escape the penalty of death, or perpetual imprisonment, or banishment, or confiscation of property. After having made them take the oath, you will cause their depositions and confessions to be taken down by some public official, and you will order those who desire to return into the Church to make an abjuration of their past errors, and to promise to discover and pursue the heretics according to your orders. . . . . As to those heretics who remain obstinate, you will make them publicly confess their errors, then you will condemn the guilty in the presence of the secular powers, and will give them over to their officers; you will condemn to perpetual imprisonment those heretics who have relapsed after their condemnation, fugitives who have returned, and those who have not come forward until the period of grace is expired." Besides this constitution, forty-six canons were published. See C. Narbonne, 1235.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 676 and 687.

Besiers, 1351.

BESIERS. Held by Peter, archbishop of Narbonne, with five bishops and the proctors of others who were unable to attend. Eight canons were published.

1. Grants to the truly penitent who bow the head at the name of Jesus, (and who have previously confessed,) an indulgence of ten days.

3. Orders prayers for the pope, the king, the queen, and the prelates.

7. That all in holy orders should abstain from meat on Saturdays, (see C. Avignon, 1337.)

8. Relates to the conduct of certain abandoned persons, who pretending themselves to be priests and prelates, fulminated excommunications against those of the clergy who had excommunicated them for their sins.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1918.

Bethlehem, (or Jerusalem,) 1672.

BETHLEHEM. Held at Bethlehem in March, 1672, but commonly named the council of Jerusalem. Dionysius, patriarch of Constantinople, at the suggestion of Dositheus, the patriarch of Jerusalem, in January, 1672, two months previous to the actual assembling of the council at Jassy, prepared an encyclical letter, which was sent round to the various prelates for the approval and signature of those who should be unable to attend the council. It asserts, in the first place, the seven sacraments, and declares an unequivocal belief that the living body of our Lord Jesus Christ is invisibly present with a real presence in the blessed Eucharist, and that the bread is really and truly and properly changed into the very body of our Saviour Christ, and that it, the holy Eucharist, is offered up as a sacrifice for all Christians, both quick and dead.

It then asserts the doctrine of baptism, and the necessity of infant baptism; denies the doctrine of final perseverance, maintains the necessity of episcopacy to a Church, the superiority of virginity to matrimony, the infallibility of the Catholic Church, the invocation of saints, the use of images, and the necessity of fasting. With regard to the Apocrypha, the letter uses much the same language with our own articles, and so far differs from the subsequent decision of the council, which adds it to the canon of Scripture.

This letter received the signatures of forty-six metropolitans and bishops, including that of Dionysius.

In March the council assembled at Bethlehem, Dositheus of Jerusalem presiding. The first act of the fathers was an ineffectual attempt to exculpate Cyril Lucar from the charge of Calvinism brought against him, and to deny the authenticity of the confession attributed to him. They then proceed to declare that the confession, whoever was its author, was never that of the Greek Church, and they repeat and authenticate

the synods of Constantinople and Jassy, concluding with a confession of faith founded on that of Peter Mogilas, though in many respects differing from it. Bethlehem, 1672.

Art. 1. On the Trinity and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone.

2. On the authority of the Church to interpret Holy Scriptures.

3. Against the doctrine of irrespective predestination.

4. Against those who call God the author of evil.

5. On the same; and on Divine Providence in turning evil into good.

6. On original sin.

7. On the incarnation and passion.

8. That there is but one Mediator, Jesus Christ, nevertheless, that the Church may and ought to have recourse to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and other saints.

9. That faith working by love, i. e. by the fulfilment of the commandments, justifies.

10. That there is a visible Catholic Church; that episcopacy is essential to it, and that it is an order entirely distinct from the priesthood.

11. Of members of the Church living in sin.

12. Of the teaching of the Holy Ghost by the Fathers and by the œcumenical Church.

13. Of good works.

14. Of free will.

15. That there are seven sacraments.

16. Of the necessity of regeneration in baptism.

17. Of the Holy Eucharist; asserts the doctrine of transubstantiation, and condemns consubstantiation.

18. Clearly admits the Latin doctrine of purgatory.

Finally, the fathers proceeded to answer the four questions of Cyril: the first two in the negative; as to the third, relating to the canon of Scripture, they admit the title of the apocryphal books to be considered as canonical; and in their answer to the fourth, they assent to the doctrine of the second council of Nicea, with regard to images. They conclude by a defence of monachism.

The acts are signed by Dositheus, the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, the ex-patriarch, seven other prelates, and the proxy of one absent, also by sixty-one

other ecclesiastics; ten signed in Arabic, the rest in Greek; the date is March 20, 1672.—*Neale's History of the Oriental Church.*

Bologna, 1317. BOLOGNA. [*Concilium Bononsiense.*] Held in 1317 by Raynaldus, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight of his suffragans. Twenty-four articles were published. In them allusion is made to the licentious life of the clergy, which rendered them an object of contempt to the people, and gave them a handle for usurping the property and rights of the Church. In canon 4 it was forbidden to the clergy to carry arms, and to enter any place of bad fame; it also minutely described the fashion and quality of their dress. In canon 12 it was forbidden to say any other mass during mass at the high altar (*cum missa celebratur in nota*). Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1655.

Bordeaux, 385. BORDEAUX. [*Concilium Burdegalense.*] Held in 385, by order of the emperor Maximus, against the Priscillianists. Instantius and Priscillianus were called upon for their defence. The former made out so bad a case for himself, that he was judged unworthy of the episcopate. Priscillianus, fearing the same treatment, ventured to appeal to the emperor from the council, which appeal the bishops weakly permitted, instead of proceeding at once to pass judgment upon him, as they ought to have done, or at least to have reserved the cause for the hearing of other bishops.

Priscillianus and the other accused parties were in consequence brought before the emperor at Treves, Idacius and Ithacius their accusers accompanying them. The zeal of these men, in endeavouring to bring the Priscillianists to judgment, would have been more commendable had it not urged them to carry matters to such an excess, that the *lives* of the accused parties were in the end forfeited; for the emperor, at the urgent request of Ithacius, and contrary to his promise made to S. Martin, condemned Priscillianus and some of his followers to death. S. Martin had before strongly urged Ithacius to desist from his violent accusations, and after this business refused to communicate with the Ithacians. Morever, S. Ambrose, the pope Siricius, and the council of Turin in 398, condemned the Ithacians, maintaining that it was far from the part of a bishop to be in any way instrumental in causing the *death* of heretics.

S. Ambrose in his writings also evinced his disgust at these cruelties, and the irregular condemnation of the Priscillianists.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1034.

BORDEAUX. Held in 1080, in the month of October. Two legates, three archbishops, and several bishops were present. The notorious Beranger here gave account of his faith, either in confirmation of what he had declared at Rome in this same year, or to retract what he had just published in contradiction of that declaration. In the end he died in the communion of the Church, January 5, 1088, in his ninetieth year.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 381. Bordeaux, 1080. (Or 1079, *Labbe.*)

BORDEAUX. Held on the 13th of April, 1255. In it Gerard of Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux, published a constitution consisting of thirty articles. Amongst other things it is enacted, that all beneficed clergy and others having the cure of souls, shall be constantly in residence; that those persons who remain in a state of excommunication for forty days shall pay nine livres, or some other suitable fine; it is absolutely forbidden to absolve any one under excommunication, even at the point of death, if he, or some one for him, hath not made satisfaction to the party interested, the priest so absolving him to be bound for him. To such an extent had the abuse of excommunications been carried in that age, that it was a common case to excommunicate in execution of a judgment, or on account of some money debt remaining unpaid. The 5th article enjoins that the consecrated host shall not be given to children who are brought to communion on Easter day, but ōnly bread which has been blessed. This appears to have been a relic of the ancient custom of giving the holy eucharist to children from the period of their baptism, which is still preserved in the Greek Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 738. Bordeaux. 1255.

BORDEAUX. Held in 1583, by Antoine, archbishop of Bordeaux. Thirty-six regulations, relating to matters of faith, morals, and discipline, were drawn up, similar to those of the council of Rheims in the same year. The last of these refers to the proper regulation of seminaries, and is divided into nine chapters, which enjoin, amongst other things, that they should be built in some open spot not far from the cathedral church; that mass and prayer should be said daily; that the members of the seminary should obey the superior and Bordeaux, 1583.

other officers; that they shall be modest in their behaviour, never eat out of the seminary, and never go out without leave; that all shall go to bed at nine, and rise at four in the morning, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 944.

Bordeaux, 1624. BORDEAUX. Held in 1624, under Francis, archbishop of Bordeaux, and cardinal. In this council twenty-two chapters, containing a large number of canons, were published, chiefly relating to discipline. —Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1632.

Bostra, 227. BOSTRA. [*Concilium Bostranum.*] Held about 227, in consequence of the errors of Beryllus, bishop of the place, who denied that our Lord Jesus Christ had any proper existence before the incarnation, and maintained that He then only began to be God when He was born of the blessed Virgin; and moreover, that He was God only because the Father dwelt in Him, as in the prophets. Origen was charged with the office of convincing him of his errors, in which, after several conferences, he succeeded, and brought him back to the catholic faith.—*Eus.* l. 6; *Hist. Ecc.* c. 33.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 651.

Bourges, 1031. BOURGES. [*Concilium Bituricense.*] Held in November, 1031, under Aymo de Bourbon, archbishop of Bourges. Twenty-five canons were published, the first of which orders the name of S. Martial to be placed amongst those of the apostles. The third forbids bishops or their secretaries to take any money on account of ordination. The seventh orders all ecclesiastics to observe the tonsure, and to be shaved. The twelfth forbids the exacting of any fee for baptism, penance, or burial, but permits the voluntary offerings of the faithful upon these occasions to be accepted.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 864.

Bourges, 1225. BOURGES. Held November 30th, 1225, by the legate, the cardinal of S. Angelo, assisted by about one hundred French bishops. Here Raymond, count of Toulouse, and his opponent Amauri de Montfort (who claimed to be count of Toulouse by virtue of grants from Innocent III., and from the king, which he pretended had been made to his father and himself), pleaded their cause, without, however, any decision being arrived at. The pope's demand of two prebends in each abbey and cathedral church, and one prebend in every other conventual church, throughout France, was rejected.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 291.

BOURGES. Held September 13th, 1276, by Simon de Brie, cardinal and legate. Sixteen articles were published, tending chiefly to the maintenance of the jurisdiction and immunities of the Church, and the freedom of elections. Amongst other things, the laity were forbidden to make use of violence or threats, in order to obtain the removal of censures. Secular judges were forbidden to constrain ecclesiastics to appear before them, &c. The canons were sent by the cardinal to every one of the French bishops.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1017. Bourges, 1276.

BOURGES. Held on the 19th September, 1286, by Simon de Beaulieu, archbishop of Bourges, assisted by three of his suffragans. Here a constitution, consisting of thirty-five articles, was published, reiterating and enforcing those of the preceding councils. Amongst other things, it was ordered that the ecclesiastical judges should annul all unlawful marriages, and separate the parties, whoever they might be; that every beneficed person who should continue for one year under excommunication, should be deprived of his benefice; that curates should keep a list of all the excommunicated persons in their parishes, and publicly denounce them every Sunday and festival; that they should warn their people to confess at least once in every year; that bows and all kinds of arms should be removed from churches: that all Sundays and festivals be properly kept; &c. Other canons relate to the regulars.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1246. Bourges, 1286.

BOURGES. See Council of Basle. Bourges, 1432.

BOURGES. Held in 1438. Convoked by king Charles VII., who presided; a large number of princes, lords, and ecclesiastics, being present. Pope Eugene IV. and the fathers of the council of Basle, sent legates. In this council the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction was drawn up for the purpose of remedying the prevailing abuses in the matter of elections to bishoprics. The French clergy had previously addressed memorials on the subject to the council of Basle, and the council, in answer to these memorials had forwarded to the king of France various decrees tending to re-establish the freedom of the Church in elections, at the same time begging him to cause them to be received in his kingdom. These decrees form the basis of the Pragmatic Sanction, which contains twenty-three articles. This Bourges, 1438.

Bourges, 1438.

constitution, styled by some writers the rampart of the Gallican Church, takes from the popes very nearly the whole of the power which they possessed, of presenting to benefices, and of judging ecclesiastical causes within the kingdom.

The twenty-three articles of the Pragmatic Sanction were drawn up upon the decrees of the council of Basle, hence the papal sanction of those decrees also approved twenty-one of those articles.

Art. 1. Relates to the authority of œcumenical councils.

2. Relates to the power and authority of the council of Basle.

3. Relates to elections, and enjoins freedom of election, &c.

4. Abolishes all reservations of benefices, &c.

5. Relates to collations and benefices, and forbids expective graces, &c.

6. Relates to judgment and causes; orders that all causes [except the greater causes] which happen at places more than four days' journey from Rome, shall be decided on the spot.

7. Relates to frivolous appeals, and confirms the decree of the 20th September of Basle.

8. Confirms the decree of the 21st session of Basle, "de pacificis possessoribus."

9. Limits the number of cardinals (twenty-third decree of Basle).

10. Relates to the annates.

11. Contains regulations relating to divine service, and enjoins that the laudable customs of particular churches in France shall be observed.

12—19. Relate to the economy of cathedral Churches.

20. Relates to concubinary clerks.

21. Relates to excommunications.

22. Treats of interdicts.

23. Concerns the pope's bulls and letters.

These articles were confirmed by the French parliament, July 13th, 1439; and the law so enacted was called the Pragmatic Sanction, and was observed in France up to the period of the concordat, which suppressed the chief part of it. During this interval the popes made vigorous attacks upon the Pragmatic Sanction, which were as vigorously resisted by the king, the parliament, and the bishops.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 1429.

BOURGES. Held by François de Tournon, archbishop of Bourges, with his suffragans. Twenty-three decrees were made, of which the first five relate to the Lutherans, and the rest to matters of discipline. Curates are exhorted to instruct their parishioners, and in order to give more time for that purpose, they are directed to abridge the prayers made at sermon time. Provincial councils are directed to be held every three years, according to the decree of the council of Constance. Bishops are ordered to visit their dioceses annually, in order that they may take due care of the sheep entrusted to them. The regulations of the council of Constance and of the pragmatic sanction, concerning the residence of canons and other ministers, are confirmed; also that which directs that the psalms be chanted slowly, and with proper pauses. Curates are directed to explain to the people the commandments of God, the Gospel, and something out of the Epistle for the day. Pastors are enjoined to forbid penitents to reveal the nature of their penance, and themselves to observe secrecy, both as to what is revealed to them at confession, and also as to the penance they have imposed. No confraternity to be erected without the consent of the ordinary. It was further enacted, that the bishops should have a discretionary power to retrench the number of festival days according as they should think best. That bishops should not grant letters dimissory, without having first examined the candidate for orders, and found him qualified; and then to those only who have a benefice or a patrimonial title. Further, that nuns shall not leave their monastery. Afterwards the council made various decrees concerning the jurisdiction and liberty of the clergy: the first is upon the subject of monitions; the second upon the residence of curates, that no dispensation for non-residence be granted without a full investigation of the reasons; the third respects cemeteries, which it orders to be kept enclosed and locked up. Bourges, 1528.

After this, four-tenths for two years were voted to king Francis I., to make up the ransom of his two sons, then hostages at Madrid, to be levied on all the clergy, secular and regular.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 426.

BOURGES. Held in September, 1584. Forty- Bourges, 1584.

six chapters were published, each containing several canons (preceded by the confession of faith made by those present). 1. Relates to the worship and service of God; 2 and 3, of the faith and preaching; 4, of the abuse of Holy Scriptures, and orders that the Latin version of the Scriptures shall alone be used, and that bishops' secretaries shall keep a list of prohibited books, which shall be shown annually to publishers; 5, of avoiding heretics; 6, of invocation of saints and of festivals; 7, of pilgrimages; 10 and 11, of relics and images; 12, of the celebration of the holy office, &c.; 16, of cemeteries; 17, of tradition; 18—28, of the sacraments; 31, of excommunication; 34, of canons and chapters; 35, of parish rectors, orders them to reside, and to say mass themselves; orders bishops to divide parishes which become too populous; where there is no parsonage-house, it directs the bishop to take care to provide one at the expense of the parishioners; 36, of benefices; 40, of witchcraft and incantations; 41 and 42, of simony, concubinary priests, &c.; 43, of hospitals; 45, of the laity, forbids them to sit with the clerks at Church, bids them to abstain from dances, plays, &c., also from the use of frizzled hair; 46, of synods.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1067.

Braga, 411.

BRAGA. [*Concilium Braccarense.*] Held about the year 411, by Pancratius, bishop of Braga, assisted by nine other bishops, who condemned the Arian and heathenish errors of the Vandals and other barbarians, who had ravaged Spain.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1508.

Braga, 560 (or 563, *Labbe.*)

BRAGA. Held about 560, by Lucretius, the metropolitan, assisted by seven other bishops, against the errors of the Priscillianists. They drew up twenty-two canons, mostly relating to ceremonies.

The seventh orders a tripartite division of the property of each Church; one for the bishop, another for the clergy, and the third for the repairs or lights of the Church, of which the archdeacon should give in an account to the bishop.

The ninth enjoins the deacons to wear the stole over the shoulder, and not to conceal it under the tunicle, in order to distinguish them from the sub-deacons.

The tenth directs that the sacred vessels be carried only by persons in holy orders.

The eleventh forbids the readers to chant in the

Church in a secular dress, and to let their [hair or beard [7]] grow.

The twelfth forbids the singing of any hymns in Church, save the Psalms, and passages taken from the Old or New Testament.

The fourteenth orders clerks who are unwilling to eat flesh, to avoid the suspicion of Priscillianism, to be compelled to eat at least herbs boiled with meat [8].

The eighteenth forbids burials within the Church.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 836.

BRAGA. Held in June, 572, by Martin, the archbishop, at the head of twelve bishops. In this council the four first œcumenical councils were acknowledged, but not the fifth, which was not yet recognized in Spain. Ten canons were drawn up.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 894. Braga, 572.

BRAGA. Held probably in 675, in the time of king Wamba. Eight bishops were present, who drew up nine canons, in order to remedy certain abuses which had crept in. Braga, 675.

The second forbids the offering of milk instead of wine, and also the dipping the bread in the wine at the holy eucharist.

The third forbids using the sacred vessels and ornaments of the Church for profane purposes.

The fourth forbids the priest to celebrate mass, or to receive the communion, without having the "orarium" or stole over both shoulders, and crossed upon his breast.

In some of these canons complaint is made of the conduct of the bishops, whom they accuse of augmenting their private estates at the expense of the Church.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 561.

BRENTFORD. [*Concilium Brandanfordense.*] Held about the year 963, by king Edgar. Here the ordinances of king Edwin were annulled, and the property which he had usurped and plundered, restored to the Church and monasteries. Also S. Dunstan was recalled from exile, and shortly afterwards preferred, successively, to the sees of Worcester and Canterbury.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 657. *Wilkins' Concilia*, vol. i. p. 224. Brentford, 963.

BRESLAU. [*Concilium Uratislaviense.*] Held in Breslau, 1268.

[7] "Granos." Garsius and Binius suppose this to have been a part of the dress. S. Isidore tells us that it refers to the hair.

[8] See C. Ancyra, canon 14.

February, 1268, by Guy, cardinal and legate, who there preached a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy Land, and succours were accordingly granted.—Conc. xi. Tom. 858.

Bretagne, 848. BRETAGNE. [*Concilium Britanicum.*] Held in 848, by order of the duke of Bretagne, to put a check upon the practice, of which the bishops were guilty, of taking money for ordinations. Convoyon, the founder and first abbot of Redon, accompanied two bishops, who were sent to Rome upon this business. See C. of Rome, 848.

Brionne, 1050. BRIONNE. [*Concilium Briotnense.*] Held in 1050. This was rather a conference than a council; in it Beranger was silenced, and made to profess the Catholic faith.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1054.

Bristol, 1216. BRISTOL. [*Concilium Bristoliense.*] Held under the pope's legate, on S. Martin's day, in 1216, upon matters relating to discipline. Eleven bishops of England and Wales were present, with others of the inferior clergy, and of the nobility who continued faithful to Henry III. The barons who opposed that monarch were excommunicated.—*Wilkins' Conc.* vol. i. p. 546.

Brixen, 1080. BRIXEN (or Bresse). [*Concilium Brixiense.*] Held in 1080, by the emperor, Henry IV. Cardinal Hugo the White, and thirty bishops were present. They maintained the rights of the emperor against pope Gregory VII., who had excommunicated him; they proceeded so far as to depose Gregory, and to elect Guibert of Ravenna in his place, who took the name of Clement III.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 389.

Buda, 1279. BUDA. [*Concilium Budense.*] Held on the 14th September, 1279, by Philip, bishop of Fermo, legate of the holy see. Sixty-nine canons were published, containing much the same regulations as others drawn up about that time, and showing that the Churches of Hungary and Poland were in great disorder. Eight of these canons relate to the dress and conduct of the clergy. The ninth forbids the clergy to sentence any one to corporal punishment, or to be present at the trial of capital causes. The thirteenth relates to the proper reverence to be observed during divine service; orders all clerks, whenever they pass the altar, the image of the Virgin or the crucifix, and whenever they enter the choir for the holy office, to bow their heads; also forbids priests to sing the hours without their surplices.

The sixteenth orders that all beneficed clergymen, having the care of souls, shall reside and discharge their duties in person, and not by a curate. The nineteenth relates to the attendance of all persons who have been cited at synods, and the proper vestments of the prelates present there. The twenty-second declares that it is not to be suffered that any one should serve at the altar or read the epistle without a surplice and cassock. The twenty-eighth declares that those persons only are to be admitted to preach who have either the pope's or the bishop's licence. Also treats of questors. The fifty-eighth excommunicated those secular powers which forbade appeals to the holy see.

It is also ordered that all the faithful should hear divine service, and especially mass, every Sunday and holyday in their own parish, and should not wander to any other Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1071.

BURGOS. [*Concilium Burgense.*] Held in 1080 (according to others in 1076), by cardinal Richard, legate. In this council the Roman office was substituted for the Gothic ritual, hitherto in use.—Tom. x. Conc. 1815. Burgos, 1080.

BURGOS. Held in 1136, by Guy, cardinal and legate, who was sent into Spain to facilitate the introduction of the Roman office, and to effect a reconciliation between the kings of Navarre and Castile, who were at war.—*Pagi.* Burgos, 1136.

C.

CAIRO. Held in . Certain bishops of Egypt having, by their conduct, given offence to many of the principal Christian inhabitants of Misra, the latter requested Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, to deprive them of his communion; and such was their importunity in this request, that they extorted from the patriarch a written promise of compliance. So far was he, however, from fulfilling this promise, that, with one exception, he retained about himself the very parties against whom exception had been taken. The other prelates, indignant at this conduct, presented a memorial to the *vizier*, requesting him to examine and pass sentence upon the conduct of their patriarch. Cairo,

The synod, accordingly, assembled in a country-house belonging to the vizier, at Misra, near Cairo. The vizier opened it by an harangue, in which he

severely rebuked the prelates for having neglected to pay that honour which, as he was informed, was due from them to their patriarch; it was impossible, he said, for him, unacquainted with their customs, and ignorant of their laws, to judge in the case before him; he therefore requested both the accusers and the accused to prepare from their canons and laws such a compendium as they thought most likely to enable him to pronounce a correct judgment. This was, accordingly, done by both parties, and at the end of three weeks (in the course of which he punished with death his head gardener for his contemptuous conduct towards the patriarch) the vizier summoned the bishops before him, and telling them that he had not read the collection of canons which they had put into his hands, and that he did not intend to read them; declared that he could do nothing else but exhort them to unity and peace, as worshippers of the same God, and as professors of the same religion; that he had already heard complaints of the love of money exhibited by some of those before him; that the proper use which a bishop should make of money, was not to pamper his appetite and to minister to his luxuries, but as Christ Himself has commanded, to give alms to the poor, &c. After much more excellent advice, he concluded by directing that each prelate should receive a written document assuring him of security and protection.

Cyril and his suffragans retired from his presence, rejoicing that so dangerous an appeal had had so happy an issue.—*Neale's Hist.*

Cairo, 1239.

CAIRO. The peace of the Church being much disturbed by the complaints which were urged against Cyril, seventy-fifth patriarch of Alexandria, fourteen bishops met together in council at Misra, near Cairo, and held a couference with him, the end of which was their agreeing to return into concord with him, upon condition of his subscribing certain chapters containing the points necessary to be reformed in the Church. To this Cyril consented, and the chapters were drawn up accordingly. At the head of these chapters was placed the confession of faith according to the decisions of the councils of Nicea, Constantinople, and Ephesus (which alone are recognized by the Jacobites). Then follows a profession concerning the observation of all things contained in Holy Scripture, the apostolical canons, and

the decrees of those councils which the Jacobite Church receives, as well as of those customs which were in use in the Coptic Church.

Amongst the new decrees then made were the following:—That the patriarch should not excommunicate any one in the diocese of another bishop, except upon lawful and canonical grounds; and not even so, except the bishop, having been duly admonished to do this, should refuse, without assigning an adequate cause.

That (on the other hand) the patriarch should not *absolve* one excommunicated by his own bishop, unless it should appear that the excommunication was unjust, and the bishop himself, after two monitions, should refuse to do so.

That each bishop should have entire control over his own diocese; that nothing should be taken from it *territorially;* and that so in like manner each bishop should confine himself to the boundaries of his diocese on the day of his consecration. That the patriarch should not apply to his own use the offerings made in the churches on festival days, or at certain accustomed times, but that they should be at the disposal of the bishop of the diocese; except the patriarch should consent, at his consecration, to take such offerings in lieu of his usual pension.

Calne, 979.

CALNE. [*Concilium Calnense.*] Held in 979, in the fourth year of S. Edward, king and martyr, in consequence of the dispute then rife between the monks and clergy, the former of whom were unduly favoured by Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, to the great prejudice of the latter. Dunstan himself presided in this council, at the head of the chief nobility, the bishops, and other ecclesiastics. No decision was, however, arrived at, owing to a singular accident which broke up the council—the floor of the chamber in which they were assembled giving way, all were precipitated to the ground, except Dunstan, whose seat escaped.—*Baronius*, A.D. 977. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 724. *Wilkin's Conc.* vol. i. p. 263.

Cambrai, 1565.

CAMBRAI. [*Concilium Cameracense.*] Held in August, 1565, Maximilian, archbishop and duke of Cambrai, presiding, assisted by the bishops of Tournai, Arras, St. Omer, and Namur. Twenty-two decrees were published, each of which contains several chapters.

The titles of the decrees are as follow:

1. Of heretical books.
2. Of theological lectures in chapters and monasteries.
3. Of schools.
4. Of seminaries.
5. Of doctrine, and the preaching of the word of God.
6. Of ceremonies, and the holy offices.
7. Of the ministry.
8. Of the life and conversation of clerks.
9. Of the examination of bishops.
10. Of the examination of pastors.
11. Of the residence of bishops and curates.
12. Of the residence of pastors, and their duties.
13. Of visitation.
14. Of the ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction.
15. Of matrimony.
16. Of tithes, &c.
17. Of purgatory.
18. Of monasteries.
19. Of the saints.
20. Of images.
21. Of relicks.
22. Of indulgences.

The 3rd, relating to schools, contains six chapters; it orders that they be visited by the curate every month, and by the rural dean at least once in each year, in order that a report may be made to the bishop.

The 12th enjoins the wearing of the surplice and stole by the priests, when they carry the holy sacrament to the sick, and also that a clerk carry a lighted taper and bell, that the people may be warned of its approach, and of their duty towards the holy sacrament and to the sick person.

Finally, the council confirmed the decrees of the council of Trent.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 147.

Canterbury, 603. CANTERBURY. [*Concilium Cantuariense.*] Held about 603, by S. Augustine, in order to confirm the foundation of a monastery which he was about to build near Canterbury, to be dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul. The king Ethelbert and his queen Bertha were present. Augustine did not live to finish this monastery and church; but the work was completed by archbishop Laurence, who succeeded him.—*Spelman. Conc. Angl. cited by Wilkins*, vol. i. p. 28.

Canterbury, 69. CANTERBURY. Held in 969, by Dunstan, arch-

bishop of Canterbury, Edgar, the king, being present, who, advocating the celibacy of the secular clergy, spoke with warmth of their present negligent and dissolute conduct. "How negligently," he said, "they conduct the services of the Church: they seem to come there rather for their own amusement than to sing the praises of the Almighty. I cannot refrain from speaking about a matter which is the cause of tears to all good people, and a subject of profane jesting to the wanton. The clergy give themselves up to the pleasures of the table, and to every shameful excess: they expend in gambling and debauchery those revenues which were left for the support and comfort of the poor." At the end of this celebrated speech of king Edgar, a plain hint is given of the violent measures then in contemplation by that monarch and the archbishop. "What wilt thou reply," said the prince, "to these complaints? I know, I know what thou wilt reply: when thou sawest a thief, thou didst not run with him, neither didst thou have thy portion with the adulterers. Thou hast convicted, thou hast besought, thou hast rebuked them. *Words have been despised; we must come to blows;* and the royal authority shall not be wanting to thee." — *Wilkins' Conc.* vol. i. p. 246.

CANTERBURY. Held in 991, in which those of the clergy of the cathedral who refused to become monks were turned out, and monks established in their places, to whom also great privileges and possessions were granted.—*Spelman. Conc. Ang.* Canterbury, 991.

CANTERBURY. Held November 1, 1439, by Henry Chichely, archbishop of Canterbury. A constitution was made for augmenting vicarages. Canterbury, 1439.

It declares that there were in the province of Canterbury many vicarages belonging to rich churches, too poor to afford a livelihood to their vicars, who were unable to afford the necessary expence of prosecuting a suit before the ordinary for the augmentation of their portion. It then orders that proceedings in such cases shall thenceforth be summary, and conducted in a plain manner, and that ordinaries shall admit such vicars to prosecute such causes "*in formâ pauperum*," and shall take care to assign them such portions as shall be suitable to the revenues of their several churches. See for a history of the long struggle against the appropriation

of the great tithes, which was maintained in England both by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, Bishop Kennet, Case of Impropriations, sect. 18—24.—*Johnson. Ecc. Canons.* A.D. 1439. Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1282. *Wilkins. Conc.* vol. iii. p. 535.

Canterbury, 1554. CANTERBURY. Held in 1554, by cardinal Pole, in which, for the sake of peace, the alienation of Church property, made in the preceding reigns, was sanctioned. —*Wilkins. Conc.* vol. iii. p. 101.

Capua, 389. CAPUA. [*Concilium Capuanum.*] Held about the year 389, for the purpose of putting an end to the schism which divided the Church at Antioch. The emperor Theodosius granted it at the instant prayer of the western Christians. The circumstances of the case were as follow:—After the death of Paulinus, Flavianus was, *rightly*, the sole bishop of Antioch, but Paulinus, before his death, had nominated Evagrius to succeed him, and he, contrary to the express injunction of the canons, was recognized by the party of Paulinus as bishop. None of the acts of the council have come down to us; but S. Ambrose speaks of it as having been numerously attended by bishops; he also says that the absence of Flavianus was the reason why the affair could not be finally decided in this council. However, in order to preserve the peace of the Church, they granted communion to all the eastern bishops who professed the Catholic faith, and entrusted to Theophilus of Alexandria and the other Egyptian bishops the decision of the differences between Flavianus and Evagrius, because they were biassed by no prejudices, and had not joined the communion of either party.

Several regulations were also made, one of which forbids to re-baptize or re-ordain any person; another forbids the translation of bishops.

Moreover, in the council, Bonosus, bishop of Macedonia, was condemned, who said that the blessed Virgin had had children by Joseph after our Lord's birth.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1039.

Cealchythe 785. CEALCHYTHE. [*Concilium Celchytum.*] Held in 785 or 787, by Gregory, bishop of Ostia, (the legate of pope Adrian,) who, in his letter to the pope, declares that Alfwald, the king, and Eanbald, the archbishop of York, with all the bishops and abbots of the country were present, besides the senators, dukes, and people of the land. Twenty canons were published, which

appear to have been previously drawn up by the legates and approved in council. Cealchythe, 785.

1. Insists upon the Nicene definition of faith being held by all clerks; orders the annual examination (in the faith) of all priests, by the bishops in their synods; receives the first six œcumenical councils.

2. Orders the administration of holy baptism at the canonical times only, except in cases of necessity; and defines the duties of sponsors [9].

3. Orders that two councils be held annually; that every bishop visit his "parish" every year, orders them to preach to and confirm their flocks, and to separate evil-doers; exhorts to the due fulfilment of all pastoral duties, and quotes Holy Scripture most appositely to that effect.

4. Directs bishops to take care that canons live canonically, and that monks and nuns behave themselves regularly, both as to diet and apparel, avoiding "the dyed colours of India and precious garments."

5. Relates to the election of abbots and abbesses.

6. Relates to the ordination of priests and deacons.

7. Directs that at all public churches the canonical hours be said with reverence.

8. Confirms ancient privileges conferred by the see of Rome on any churches; cancels all uncanonical privileges.

9. Forbids ecclesiastics to eat in private, (unless on account of great infirmity [1].)

10. Forbids ministers to celebrate mass with naked legs; orders that bread be offered by the faithful, and not crusts; forbids chalices made of horn; also forbids bishops to judge secular matters, quoting 2 Tim. ii. 4; and entreats that prayer be made assiduously for the Church.

11. Relates to right government by kings; orders princes to obey their bishops, because to them is committed the power of binding and loosing; exhorts all persons to honour the Church.

12. Relates to the election of kings: orders that it shall be made by the priests and elders of the people; orders all men to honour the king, and directs that, if

[9] The Creed and the Lord's Prayer are, in this canon, mentioned as necessary to be known by all.

[1] This canon appears only to have been meant to prevent ecclesiastics from merely "appearing unto men to fast."

Cealchythe, 785.

a bishop or priest shall conspire against him, he shall, like Judas, be thrust out from the apostolical degree.

13. Exhorts the great and rich to judge righteously, and without regard to persons or bribes.

14. Forbids to impose unjust tributes upon the Church; exhorts to concord amongst all Christian people.

15. Forbids unrighteous marriages.

16. Declares the sons of whores and nuns, and those born in adultery, to be deprived of lawful inheritance; declares a virgin devoted to God to be the spouse of Christ; declares that the council presumes not to add to nor take from what has been prescribed in the canon, and in the Gospel, and in the decrees of the apostles, concerning lawful marriage and its use.

17. Declares that many refusing to pay tythe, are often reduced themselves to a tenth, and orders the payment of tythe, and that men should live upon and give alms from the remaining nine parts; also forbids usury and unjust weights and measures.

18. Exhorts to the faithful discharge of vows made in prosperity or adversity.

19. Forbids all Pagan rites, &c.; forbids the wearing of Gentile garments, the maiming of horses, the use of sorcery, and the eating of horse-flesh, which last practice is mentioned as not uncommon.

20. Exhorts all to prepare for death, by confessing, receiving the holy eucharist, and repenting; forbids prayer to be made for such as die without confession and repentance.

After the signatures appended to these canons, the legate proceeds, in his letter to the pope, to say, "When this was finished, and we had given our blessing, we departed, taking with us the legate of the king, and the archbishop, &c., who carried the decree with them to the council of the Mercians, where the glorious king, Offa, with the counsellors of the land, together with Janbyrht[2], the archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury, and the rest of the bishops of the country, were assembled." It then appears that the canons were again approved, and signed by Offa and his lords, by the archbishop and twelve bishops, and by four abbots, in this Mercian council.

[2] Jambert, or Lambert, according to Wilkins.

There were two councils held in the same year, in which these canons, called "the canons of Cealchythe," were read and approved: the first in Northumberland, and the second in Mercia; in which of these two kingdoms the place called Cealchythe was situated is unknown. Bishop Gibson suggests that it was probably the same with Kelcheth, in Lancashire, on the borders of Cheshire.

The date of this council, according to Sir H. Spelman, is 797.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canon.* Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1861. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 145.

CEALCHYTHE. Held July 26, 816, Wulfred, archbishop of Canterbury, presiding. Besides Kenulf, king of the Mercians, and his lords, there were present twelve bishops, amongst whom were those of Rochester, Selsea, Hereford, Lindisfarn, and London. Many abbots, priests, and deacons also attended. Eleven canons were published. Cealchythe, 816.

1. Relates to the faith and canonical precepts of the fathers.

2. Orders that churches newly built be consecrated by the bishop of the diocese, and that certain relics, or at least the eucharist, be there deposited; that it be written up to what saints the churches are dedicated.

3. Exhorts to unity, and mutual prayer one for another.

4. Gives to every bishop the power of electing the abbots and abbesses of his diocese, with the consent and advice of the family; orders due inquiry to be made respecting the fitness of those to be elected.

5. Forbids any one of Scottish extraction to usurp to himself the sacred ministry in any one's diocese, and to attend the priest when he celebrates mass [3].

6. Forbids the judgments of former bishops, confirmed by a synodical decree, to be infringed; directs that, in all cases, whatever has been corroborated with the sign of the cross shall remain in full force.

[3] "Nullus permittatur de genere Scotorum in alicujus diœcesi sacrum sibi ministerium usurpare, neque ei consentire liceat ex sacro ordine aliquod attingere, vel ab eis accipere in baptismo, aut in celebratione missarum, vel etiam eucharistiam populo præbere, *quia incertum est nobis, unde et an ab aliquo ordinentur.* . . . respuendum est ab alienis nationibus sacra ministeria percipere, cum quibus nullus ordo metropolitanis, nec honor aliquis habeatur."

7. Forbids bishops, abbots, and abbesses to diminish the estates of their churches, or to grant away the inheritance of them for any longer time than for one man's life, (and this with the consent of the fraternity); enumerates a few cases in which such alienation is allowable.

8. Directs that houses once erected into monasteries, with the advice of the bishop, shall remain so for ever; any priest, deacon, clerk, or nun offending against this canon to be deposed, anathematized, and excommunicated.

9. Relates to synodical judgments.

10. Orders that upon the death of a bishop, one-tenth of his substance be given, for his soul's sake, to the poor, that all his English slaves be set free, that at the sound of the bell throughout the parishes every congregation should meet in the basilicon, and there sing thirty Psalms together for the soul of the deceased, that afterwards, every prelate and abbot should sing six hundred Psalms, cause one hundred and twenty masses to be celebrated, and set free three slaves, giving them three shillings each; it further orders that for thirty days, when the canonical hours were finished, seven belts[4] of pater nosters should be said for the departed soul, and that his obiit be renewed on the thirtieth day.

11. Orders that bishops be content with their own dioceses, and abstain from interfering in those of others; charges all priests not to refuse baptism, directs them not to pour water on the child's head, but to immerse it in the font, and that thrice.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canon.* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1484. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 169.

Carpentras, 527.

CARPENTRAS. [*Concilium Carpentoractense.*] Held in 527. Cæsarius of Arles presiding at the head of sixteen bishops. They published but one canon, which forbids the bishop to take any thing from the parishes within his diocese, provided he has a sufficient revenue for his maintenance. In this council also Agrecius, bishop of Antibes, was suspended during a year for conferring orders contrary to the canons.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1663.

[4] "*VII. beltidum Pater noster.*" "This seems to imply that they had in this age belts with studs fastened on to them, (like the beads now in use with Romanists,) for the numbering of their prayers."—*Johnson.*

CARTHAGE (or AFRICA). [*Concilium Carthaginiense.*] Held by S. Cyprian, at the head of sixty-six bishops, about 253 (?). Here a letter was read from Fidus, who informed them that another bishop named Therapis, had granted reconciliation to Victor, who had been ordained priest a long time before, without his having undergone a full and entire course of penance, and that, too, when the people had not required it, nor even known any thing about it; and there was no plea of necessity, such as illness, to constrain him. The council expressed great indignation at the act, and administered a strong rebuke to Therapis; nevertheless, they would not deprive of communion Victor, who had been admitted to it by his own bishop. Carthage, 253?

This same Fidus also started the opinion, that holy baptism should not be administered to infants until the eighth day, that being the divine law in regard to circumcision; but no bishop present supported him. On the contrary, they decided, unanimously, that God hath no respect either to persons or ages; that circumcision was but the figure of the mystery of Jesus Christ, and that no one may be shut out from the grace of God. S. Cyprian, who wrote this decision to Fidus in his own name and in that of his colleagues, gives the reason for it in these words: "If the greatest sinners coming to the faith receive remission of sin and baptism, how much less can we reject a little infant just born into the world, free from actual sin, and only so far a sinner as being born of Adam after the flesh, and by its first birth having contracted the pollution of the former death; it ought to have so much the easier access to the remission of sins, inasmuch, as not its own sins, but those of others are remitted."

These words are quoted by S. Jerome in his three dialogues against the Pelagians; and by St. Augustin in his 294th sermon, in order to prove that belief in original sin has always been the faith of the Church.—*Cyprian, Epist.* 55. Tom. i. Conc. p. 741.

CARTHAGE. Held in 254, by S. Cyprian, at the head of thirty-six bishops. It was decided that Basilides, bishop of Leon, and Martial, bishop of Astorga, could not be any longer recognised as bishops, being both of them amongst the "Libellatici," and also guilty of various crimes.—*Fleury.* Tom. i. Conc. p. 746. Carthage, 254.

Carthage, 255.

CARTHAGE. Held in 255. Eighteen bishops of Numidia having applied to S. Cyprian for advice upon the subject of baptism, those who, having received the form out of the Church, were anxious to be received into her; he, with the assent of the council, replied that they ought, by all means, to follow the ancient practice, which was to baptize every one received into the Church, who had previously been baptized only by heretics or schismatics.—*Cyp. Ep.* 79. Tom. i. Conc. p. 761.

Carthage, 255.

CARTHAGE. About this time several councils were held at Carthage upon the same subject. In this council seventy-one bishops were present from the provinces of Africa and Numidia, S. Cyprian presiding. They decided that there can be no valid baptism out of the Catholic Church, and addressed a synodical letter to Stephen upon the subject, informing him of their decision upon this and other matters. With regard to external baptism they speak thus:—"Eos qui sint foris extra ecclesiam tincti, et apud hæreticos et schismaticos profanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad ecclesiam, quæ una est, venerint, baptizari oportere; eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum S. nisi accipiant et ecclesiæ baptismum."—*S. Cyp. Ep.* 72.

Nothing is more clear than that the whole of Africa followed this custom from ancient times, as well as Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and several other Asiatic provinces.

This matter was the cause of a dispute between S. Cyprian and Stephen of Rome; which last had no sooner received the synodical letter above-mentioned, than he refused to confirm the decision of the council, and instantly separated himself from the communion of Cyprian and the other bishops composing the council. —Tom. i. Conc. p. 763.

Carthage, 255.

CARTHAGE. Another council was held in September in the same year, attended by eighty-seven bishops from the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania. The letter of Jubayen was read, who had written to consult S. Cyprian upon the subject of baptism, and likewise the answer of Cyprian. Also the letter of Cyprian and the former council to Stephen was read, and the answer of the latter. It does not

appear that this answer, although accompanied by threats of excommunication, had the effect of shaking the opinion of S. Cyprian. Carthage, 255.

After these papers had been read, S. Cyprian delivered a discourse, in which forcibly, yet mildly, testifying his disapproval of the conduct of those who would, as it were, make themselves bishops over other bishops [5], in wishing to compel them, by a tyrannical fear, to submit absolutely to their opinion; he again protested that he left to each full liberty in his faith as to the subject before them, without judging or desiring to separate them from communion with himself on that account. The other bishops present then delivered their opinion, afterwards S. Cyprian himself declared his own, and all agreed unanimously.

Nevertheless, pope Stephen, filled with anger, refused even to grant an audience to the deputies of the council, and S. Cyprian wrote upon the subject to Firmilian, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia. The latter in his answer declares twice, that in his opinion the pope had entirely broken peace with Africa; and that he did not fear to assert that Stephen, by the very act of separating all others from his communion, had, in fact, separated himself from all the other faithful, and therefore from the communion of the Catholic Church; and, by so doing, had really become *himself* schismatical. This contest lasted until the pontificate of Sixtus, who succeeded Stephen, and it seems the bishops of Africa, little by little, yielded their opinion. S. Jerome says, that many of the same bishops who had declared in council the invalidity of heretical baptism, afterwards concurred in a contrary decree.

As for S. Cyprian himself, the Church of Rome has always expressed veneration for him, and has admitted his name into the sacred canon of the mass, and probably he died in communion with her; his martyrdom took place in 258, under Valerian, and after the death of Stephen, which happened in 257.

"This holy bishop," writes S. Augustine, "presiding though he did over so magnificent a church, and being

[5] "Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli, quid sentiamus, proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem si diversum senserit amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrûm Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad observandi necessitatem collegas suos adigit."

himself so distinguished for understanding and eloquence, and for virtue, nevertheless, permitted others to combat his opinion without desiring to separate himself from their communion; and when we consider what multitudes would have followed him had he separated, we cannot but admire the spirit of real charity which distinguished him throughout this celebrated dispute." —Tom. i. Conc. p. 786. *Pagi.*

Carthage, 348. CARTHAGE. Held in 348 or 349, after a great number of the Donatists had united themselves to the Church, under Gratus, bishop of Carthage. Bishops from all the provinces of Africa attended it, but neither their number nor the names of the greatest part of them are come down to us.

Gratus having returned thanks to Almighty God for the termination of the schism which had for so many years rent the African Church, they proceeded to publish fourteen canons. The first forbids to re-baptize those who have been baptized in the name of the Sacred Trinity; the second forbids to honour those as martyrs, who, by their indiscretion, have been instrumental in bringing about their own death, and treats generally of the honour due to the martyrs; the third and fourth forbid the clergy to dwell with women; it was also ruled, that three bishops are necessary in order to judge a deacon, six for the trial of a priest, and twelve for that of a bishop.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 713.

Carthage, 390. CARTHAGE. Held in 390, by Genethlius, bishop of Carthage. The number of the bishops present is unknown. They first drew up a profession of the Catholic faith, and then proceeded to publish thirteen canons.

The first enjoins belief in the Holy Trinity.

The second enjoins continence upon all the clergy.

The third forbids the consecration of the chrism by priests, as also the consecration of virgins, and the reconciliation of penitents at public mass, by them.

The seventh orders, that those of the clergy receiving persons who have been excommunicated by any bishop, without his permission, shall be also excommunicated.

The twelfth forbids the consecration of a bishop without the consent of the metropolitan.

From the canons of this council it appears plainly, that the *bishop* was the *ordinary* minister in cases of

penance, and the priest only in his absence, or in cases of necessity.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1158.

CARTHAGE. Held in 397, under Aurelius, the bishop, at the head of forty-four or forty-eight bishops, amongst whom was S. Augustin. They published fifty canons. The first orders every bishop to ascertain from the primate, yearly, the day upon which the festival of Easter should be celebrated. The second enjoins that a council be held annually. The third directs that all the bishops and clergy shall acquire a knowledge of the canons of the Church before their consecration. The fourth forbids the ordination of deacons or the veiling of the consecrated virgins before their twenty-fifth year. The sixth forbids the administration of baptism or the eucharist to the dead. The twenty-first forbids any bishop to ordain the clergy of another diocese. The twenty-ninth orders that mass be said fasting. The thirty-fourth allows the baptism of sick persons unable to speak, if their desire of this be guaranteed by their friends. The thirty-ninth forbids the consecration of a bishop by less than three bishops. The forty-sixth forbids the translation of bishops. The forty-seventh canon forbids the reading of any thing in the Church under the name of sacred Scripture, except the canonical writings, among which are included the apocryphal books of Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, and the two books of Maccabees. S. Augustin's "whole canon of Scripture," in his treatise De Doctrinâ Christianâ, is identical with the list contained in this forty-seventh canon of the council of Carthage, at which that father was present.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1165. Carthage, 397.

CARTHAGE. Held November 8th, 398, under Aurelius of Carthage, at the head of two hundred and fourteen or two hundred and fifteen bishops, including S. Augustin. One hundred and four canons were published, chiefly relating to the life and conduct of the clergy. Carthage, 398.

1. Enjoins that no one be elevated to the episcopate without accurate inquiry first made as to his faith and moral character, in order to ascertain whether he hold the catholic faith, and have all the virtues necessary for the office; whether he be prudent, docile, moderate, chaste, sober, charitable, humble, well instructed in the word of God, &c.

Carthage, 398.

The eight canons following are upon the ordination of bishops, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, &c. &c. &c.

The 15th directs that bishops shall have nothing but what is plain and simple, either at table or in their furniture, and recommends that they should distinguish themselves only by the lustre of their faith and virtue.

The 16th prohibits bishops from reading the works of heathens, but allows those of heretics to be read in case of necessity.

The 22d forbids that a bishop should ordain any one without the consent of his clergy, and the testimony of the laity.

The 24th orders that all persons leaving the church during the time of sermon be excommunicated.

The 34th forbids a bishop, whilst seated, to keep a priest standing.

The 38th permits a deacon, in cases of great necessity, to administer the eucharist in the presence of a priest.

The 51st and two following canons order the clergy to get their living by some honest trade [6].

The 61st orders that a clergyman swearing by any creature be severely rebuked, and if he continues in fault he is to be excommunicated.

The 64th declares those persons not to be catholics who fast upon Sunday.

The 66th enjoins that the clergy who consider themselves harshly treated by their bishop, may appeal to a synod.

The 70th forbids all the clergy to keep company with heretics and schismatics.

The 83rd directs that greater respect be paid to old people, and to the poor, than to others.

The 84th allows every person whatever, whether heretic, Jew, or pagan, to remain in church until the mass of the catechumens.

The 93rd and 94th order that the offerings of those who are at variance, or those who oppress the poor, be rejected.

The 99th forbids a woman, however well instructed

[6] These canons were directed against the Massaliani, who denied that it was lawful for the religious to labour for their bread. See Epiphanius, Hæres. 8vo.

and holy, to presume to teach in an assembly of men. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1196.

Carthage. 401.

CARTHAGE (or AFRICA). Held about the year 401, in June, by Aurelius, at the head of sixty-two bishops. It was agreed that deputies should be sent to Rome and to Milan, to submit for approval a scheme for putting into the order of clergy the children of Donatists who had been converted. The great scarcity of clergy in Africa arose chiefly from the oppression of the Donatists, and the extreme caution of the bishops in making choice of fit persons. Fifteen canons[7] were drawn up, one of which directs that the bishop shall live at his cathedral church. The decree concerning the continence of the clergy was confirmed.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1241.

Carthage. 411. Celebrated conferences between the Donatists and Catholics.

CARTHAGE. Held on the 1st of June, 411, with a view of uniting the Donatists to the Church, and convincing them of the necessity of seeking for salvation in the catholic Church.

These heretics appear to have increased to that degree in Africa, that they were in a fair way to overwhelm the catholics altogether, and from the time of their obtaining full liberty they were guilty of acts of violence equal to those of the greatest persecutors.

The catholic bishops having at last persuaded the emperor Honorius to allow a public conference with the Donatists, Marcellinus was sent over to Africa by order of that prince, who appointed the 1st of June for the day of meeting. He also ordered that seven bishops only on each side should take part in the conference, to be chosen by the whole number, but that each party might have seven other bishops, with whom the disputants might take counsel, if they needed it; that no other bishop should be permitted to take part in the conference than the fourteen disputants; and lastly, that each party should bind itself to stand by the acts of those whom they had named to represent them, and that notes of what passed should be taken by public notaries.

[7] It is doubtful whether these canons were published in this or in a preceding council held in the same year. See C. AFRICA, A.D. 401. The note of Binius on this subject is as follows: "Triginta duo canones de ecclesiasticâ disciplinâ, hoc aliisque præcedentibus conciliis Africanis constituti, in hac synodo confirmati, vel saltem iterum promulgati fuerint."—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1241, *note.*

Carthage, 411.

The Donatists, however, refused these terms, and desired that all their bishops should be present. The catholics, on their part, wrote to Marcellinus, accepting his offers. In this letter they declare their object to be to show that the holy church throughout all the world cannot perish, however great may be the sins of those who are members of it; and further they declare their willingness, if the Donatists can show that the catholic church is reduced to their communion, to submit themselves entirely to them, to vacate their sees and all their rights; but if the catholics, on the other hand, can show that the only true Church is in their communion, and that the Donatists are in error, that they will, nevertheless, preserve to them the episcopal honour; that in cities where there are both a Catholic and a Donatist bishop, both shall sit alternately in the episcopal chair, and that when one of the two shall die, the survivor shall remain sole bishop.

Then they named, as their representative bishops in the conference, Aurelius of Carthage, Alipius of Tagaste, S. Augustin, Vincentius of Capua, Fortunatus of Cirtha, Fortunatianus of Sicca, and Possidius of Calama. Seven others were also named for consultation, and four more as sureties that the result of the conference should be observed faithfully. The Donatists also (being compelled) named their representatives in the same order.

II. Session. In the second sitting, after a long discussion, a delay was granted to the Donatists.

III. Session. In the third sitting the Donatists did every thing in their power to prevent the question of the origin of the schism being inquired into; but Marcellinus caused the statement of Anulinus the Proconsul to be read, in which he set forth the complaints of the Donatists against Cecilianus. The Donatists, being thus hard pushed, presented a memorial, in which they endeavoured to show, from Holy Scripture, that bad pastors are spots and defilements in the Church, and that she cannot have amongst her children any that are openly wicked. After this document had been read, the Catholics answered it through S. Augustin. He strongly established this verity, that the Church in this world must endure evil members, both open and concealed, and that the good, although they are mingled with the evil, do not participate in their sin. From S. Cyprian he showed that it was in the Church that the devil sowed

the tares (which was contested by the Donatists), the object of the Catholics being to prove that neither the faults of Cecilianus nor of any one else could in any way affect their communion. Augustin then proceeded to say that Holy Scripture may not be so interpreted as to contradict itself, and that those passages which each party brought forward in support of their own views must in some way be reconciled. He showed that the Church is to be regarded in two lights, first, as she is, militant in this world, having within her both good and bad men; and secondly, as she will be, triumphant in Heaven, when all evil shall be purged out of her; he also explained how the faithful are bound in this life to separate from the evil, viz. by withdrawing from all participation in their evil deeds, not by separating from them outwardly. Carthage. 411.

When the Donatists found themselves too closely pressed by the reasoning of Augustin, they declared plainly that they did not conceive themselves to be permitted to join in any act of devotion with those who were not perfectly just, and true saints, for which reason they regarded the holy sacraments as utterly null and void, except they were administered by persons whom they conceived to be of irreproachable life, and for the same cause they insisted upon rebaptizing Catholics. S. Augustin, in reply, showed plainly that such a notion went at once to overthrow all external religion whatever, since difficulties without end must arise upon the question of the personal holiness of ministers.

They now proceeded to inquire into the original cause of the rupture between the Donatists and Catholics. The former maintained that they were justified in separating from Cecilianus, who had been consecrated by men who were themselves "*Traditores*[8]." However, the proofs which they alleged were without weight, and Augustin, in few words, again refuted their error, and further unravelled all their tricks and shifts. He bade them bear in mind, that Mensurius, the predecessor of Cecilianus, although charged with the same crime of having given up the sacred volumes, was yet never publicly condemned; that the council of Carthage against Cecilianus condemned him in his absence, and

[8] "*Traditores*," persons who, in the time of persecution, had delivered up the sacred books to the inquisitors.

Carthage, 411.

that this was done by bishops who in the council of Cirtha had been pardoned for the very same crime, in proof of which he caused the acts of the council of Cirtha, A. D. 305, to be read.

After various shifts on the part of the Donatists in the matter of this last-mentioned council, the acts of the council of Rome, in 313, absolving Cecilianus, were read, and also the letter of Constantine to Eumalus, upon the subject of the contradictory judgment which that prince had given in the matter of Cecilianus. It seemed, indeed, as M. Tillemont observes, as if the Almighty constrained the Donatists to speak in spite of themselves, since the very document which they produced served only to bring out more clearly the innocence of Cecilianus, for, first, wishing to show that Constantine, after having absolved Cecilianus, had condemned him again by a later judgment, they were blind enough to produce a petition which they had formerly addressed to the prince, in which it appeared that he had himself condemned them, and maintained the innocence of Cecilianus; secondly, they produced a letter of Constantine, in which he acknowledges that the cause of Felix of Aptonga had not been examined and judged impartially, and in which he ordered that Inquitius should be sent to him, who allowed that he had told a lie, in order to bring about the condemnation of Felix.

Now, nothing could better serve the cause of the Catholics and more confound the Donatists, than to show that this very Felix was in truth *innocent* of the charge upon which he had been condemned; for properly speaking, their charge against Cecilianus was, that he had been consecrated by a man who had delivered up the Holy Scriptures. But to complete the proof of the innocence of Felix, the Catholics produced the statement of the proconsul Œlianus, who had acted as judge in the affair, and the very acts of the judgment, to none of which had the Donatists any thing to object; and finally, the Catholics having entirely established every thing that they had asserted, Marcellinus gave sentence, two hundred and eighty-one articles of which still remain to us; it was to the effect that the Donatists had been entirely refuted by the Catholics; that Cecilianus had been justified, and that even had the crimes with which he had been accused been proved against him, it would in no way have affected the Catholic

Church, and that, accordingly, those of the Donatists who should refuse to unite themselves to the Church, should be punished as the laws directed.

From this sentence the Donatists appealed to the emperor, but in vain. Honorius confirmed the acts of the conference of Carthage by a law, bearing date the 30th of August, 414.

This conference may be said to have given the death-blow to Donatism. From this time the sectarians came in crowds to unite themselves to the true Church, and the heresy declined.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1335.

CARTHAGE. Held in 412, against Celestius, the disciple of Pelagius. Whilst this heretic was busily sowing the seeds of his heresy in Carthage, he was denounced to the bishops by certain faithful catholics, especially Paulinus the deacon, who had been scandalized by his teaching. Aurelius forthwith called together such of his brethren as were in the city, and cited Celestius to appear before the council. When they were assembled, the petition containing the charges against him was read, accusing him, amongst other things, of teaching that the sin of Adam only injured himself, and that its effects have not descended to his posterity, and that every child is born into the world in the same condition in which Adam was before the fall. Celestius did not deny the accusation, for, although he agreed that children must of necessity receive redemption by baptism, yet he refused to acknowledge that the sin of Adam had passed upon them; nor would he confess, unequivocally, that they receive therein remission of any sin: accordingly he was condemned and excommunicated.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1510. Carthage, 412.

CARTHAGE. Held in 416, against Pelagius and Celestius. It was composed of sixty-seven bishops, whose names are preserved; Aurelius of Carthage presiding. The letters of Heros and Lazarus were read, in which they accused Pelagius and Celestius of errors worthy to be visited with the censures of the Church. Then the acts of the council of 412, against Celestius, were read. It was finally resolved that both he and Pelagius should be anathematised, unless they would unequivocally abjure their wicked doctrine. A synodical letter was also addressed to pope Innocent, to inform him of the affair, in order that he might add the weight of his authority to their decree. In this Carthage, 416.

letter the principal errors of Pelagius are specified and refuted summarily from Holy Scripture; to it were added the letter of Heros and Lazarus, and the acts of the council of 412, in which Celestius was condemned. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1533.

Carthage, 418.

CARTHAGE. Held in 418, by Aurelius at the head of two hundred and fourteen bishops. S. Augustin, in several places, calls it a council of Africa. In it, certain decrees concerning the faith were made against the Pelagians, which were subsequently approved by the whole Church. Prosper has preserved one of these decrees, in which the fathers in council declare that the grace of God given to us through Jesus Christ, not only assists us to know what is right, but also to practise it in each particular action; so that without it we can neither have, nor think, nor say, nor do any thing which appertains to holiness and true piety.

At the head of these decrees, the two hundred and fourteen bishops wrote to Zosimus, the pope, declaring that they were resolved that the sentence passed by his predecessor Innocent, against Pelagius and Celestius, should remain in force against them, until both of them should clearly recognize the necessity of divine grace, agreeably to the decrees of the council; and that so they need never hope to return into the bosom of the Church without abjuring their errors. They also reminded the pope of the mean opinion which Innocent had of the council of Diospolis, and represented to him that he ought not to have given ear so readily to the representations of a heretic. Lastly, they laid before him all that had passed in Africa upon the subject. This letter was carried to Rome by Marcellinus, subdeacon of Carthage[9].—*Bar.* 416. xxv. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1576.

Cashel, 1171.

CASHEL. [*Concilium Cassiliense.*] Held in 1171, by Radulphus, archdeacon of Llandaff, by order of Henry, king of England; Christian, bishop of Lismore, presided. All the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of Ireland were present, who swore fidelity to Henry. Eight canons were published, intended to remedy the

[9] Pagi proves that two councils were held in this year upon this subject. The first, which S. Augustin calls an "African" council, was ended about the middle of February; the second was held in May. See C. Africa, A.D. 418.

disorders which prevailed. By the first canon, we learn that polygamy was, at this time, common amongst the Irish, and it directs that no marriages shall be celebrated other than the law permits. The third orders the payment of the tithe of cattle, fruit, and all other produce, to the parish church: for many did not even know that it was due, and had never paid it.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 472.

CATALONIA. [*Concilium Catalauniense.*] Held in May, 1246, by the archbishop of Tarragona, and six other bishops. Amongst other things, they ordered that Saracenic slaves, who demanded to be baptized, should remain some days with the rector of the parish, in order to give proof of their conversion,—a space of time, as Fleury observes, short enough. Catalonia, 1246.

CESAREA, in PALESTINE. Held in 197. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were as follows. The Asiatic churches wished that Easter should be celebrated on the same day on which the Jews were directed to kill the Paschal Lamb, i. e. on the fourteenth day of the moon, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall, and in after times they who supported this opinion were called quartodecimani. Other churches preserved the custom which they had received by apostolical tradition, of ending the fast and celebrating Easter on that day of the week on which our Lord rose. Theophilus, bishop of Cesarea, and Narcissus, of Jerusalem, presided. Cassius of Tyre and Clarius of Ptolemais were present, with many other bishops. They decided that Easter-day should be celebrated on the Sunday, and wrote a synodal letter to that effect.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 596. Cesarea, in Palestine, 197.

CHALCEDON. [*Concilium Chalcedonense.*] The fourth œcumenical council was held at Chalcedon in 451, against the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies. Chalcedon, 451. Fourth Œcumenical Council.

The heresy of Eutyches consisted in his acknowledging only one nature in our Lord Jesus Christ: he was a priest, and abbot of a monastery near Constantinople; and Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum [1], having cited him to give an account of his faith before a council consisting of thirty-three bishops, and twenty-three abbots, Eutyches there refused to retract, and was con-

[1] Or rather, Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople. See C. CONSTANTINOPLE, 448.

Chalcedon, 451.

demned, and separated from the communion of the faithful. He then took upon him to write to S. Leo, the pope, imploring his protection, and sent to him a pretended profession of faith. Leo, deceived by these pretences, wrote to Flavianus of Constantinople, expressing his surprise at the sentence passed upon Eutyches. Flavianus, however, wrote back to him a true account of the matter, declaring that Eutyches maintained, that before his Incarnation our Blessed Lord had Two Natures, the Divine and Human, but that after his Incarnation He had but One; and he further entreated the pope to add his own testimony to the condemnation of Eutyches. By these statements Leo was convinced of the justice of the sentence, and, moreover, perceived the bad results which must follow from the patronage which the emperor Theodosius extended to Eutyches, especially in convoking a council at Ephesus to reconsider the sentence of excommunication which had been passed upon him.

This pseudo-council assembled at Ephesus in 449, consisting of one hundred and thirty bishops, with Dioscorus of Alexandria, the great friend of Eutyches, as president; the censure before passed upon the latter was annulled, and Flavianus, who had condemned him, was with the utmost violence deposed. This pseudo-council, from the extreme irregularity and violence which accompanied all its acts, has been always known by the name of the "Latrocinium." Leo, distressed at these proceedings, wrote to the emperor a letter worthy of a Christian bishop, setting clearly before him what impious and sacrilegious acts had been done in that council, in open violation of the Catholic faith and of the canons of the Church; and he implored him in the name of all the churches of the West to convoke an œcumenical council in Italy. At the same time, he wrote to Pulcheria to entreat her to use all her influence to hinder this attack upon the Catholic faith from having more fatal results. He, lastly, addressed the clergy and people of Constantinople, and exhorted them to persevere in the true faith.

Dioscorus, irritated by the opposition which his designs met with, and especially by that of S. Leo, separated himself from his communion, and by threats or otherwise, induced ten other bishops to concur in this schismatical act. This only caused Leo to re-

double his efforts, and availing himself of the opportunity of a voyage which the emperor, Valentinian III., made to Rome at the time, he forcibly set before him the danger with which the true faith was threatened, and conjured him to induce Theodosius to repair by his authority the evil that had been committed at Ephesus, and to annul all that they had decreed there in an œcumenical assembly. But although Valentinian wrote upon the subject to Theodosius, he refused to permit the question to be re-agitated, and endeavoured to justify the act of the pseudo-council of Ephesus. Chalcedon, 451.

However, Theodosius dying in that very year in consequence of injuries received by a fall from his horse, Marcian, by his marriage with Pulcheria, became emperor, and all obstacles to the holding of the council were removed. His chief desire was to see all his subjects united in one faith; and the empress herself wrote to S. Leo, to assure him of her anxiety to see peace restored to the Church, and to banish all error and heresy, and for that end to cause the council to be assembled. An account of the events which occurred up to the time of the assembling of the council of Chalcedon, will be found under the head of the council of Constantinople, 448.

Marcian, at the petition of the bishops, consented to convoke an œcumenical council, as the only true remedy for the evils under which the Church laboured; and first he appointed Nicea as the place for holding it, by a letter addressed to Anatolus of Constantinople, and to all metropolitans, ordering them to attend there with the bishops of their respective provinces, and the most learned and talented of their clergy, declaring that all factions and cabal should be prevented, and that he would himself attend in person.

As custom and the state of things in the empire hindered S. Leo from appearing at the council, he sent Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, and Bonifacius, to assist Lucentius and Basil (whom he had already sent into the East to investigate the case of the bishops who condemned Flavianus in the "Latrocinium"), as his legates; and these four, by the emperor's desire, were appointed to act as presidents in the approaching council.

Whilst the bishops were assembling at Nicea, certain troubles broke out in Illyria, which rendered it impos-

Chalcedon, 451.

sible for Marcian to absent himself so far from Constantinople; and he, accordingly, transferred the council to Chalcedon, which was separated from Constantinople by the Bosphorus only. Thither, then, the bishops came in vast multitudes towards the end of September; their number is reckoned at six hundred and thirty; all from the East, except the four legates of the pope[2]. Three other distinguished bishops, however, were also present, viz. Maximus of Antioch, Eusebius of Dorylæum, and Theodoret, whom the emperor had recalled from exile.

The emperor sent as his representatives the chief officers of the empire: Anatolius, a nobleman, Palladius, prefect of the Pretorium in the East; the prefect of Constantinople, Vincomulus; Sporacius, captain of the imperial guard; various other persons of the highest dignity were also present. Moreover Marcian, from the high idea which he had formed of S. Leo, wishing him to have the chief authority in the council; Leo in his letter begged them to consider his legates as his representatives, and especially designated Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, in Sicily, to act as president in his absence, rightly judging that there needed at the head of the council a man of firm mind, and one incapable of being turned aside from the right path.

It was arranged that the officers of the emperor should propose the questions for discussion, draw up the various motions, and pronounce the decision, after that the bishops had given their votes.

I. Session.

On the 8th of October, 451, the council assembled in the Church of St. Euphemia; in the centre sat the officers of the emperor, at their left, or on the epistle side, sat the bishops of Constantinople, Antioch, Cesarea in Cappadocia, and of the other Eastern dioceses, and Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, together with the four legates; on the other side were Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius of Cesarea, and the other bishops of Egypt, Palestine, and Illyria, most of whom had been present in the pseudo-council of Ephesus. In the midst were the Holy Gospels, placed upon a raised seat. When they had taken their seats, the legates of the pope demanded that Dioscorus should withdraw from the assembly,

[2] Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, Lucentius, and Boniface, and Basil, cardinal-priests.

accusing him of his scandalous conduct at Ephesus, and declaring that otherwise they would depart. Then the imperial officers ordered him to withdraw from the council, and to take his seat amongst the accused. Chalcedon, 451.

At the request of Eusebius of Dorylœum, the petition which he had presented to the emperor against Dioscorus was read. In this petition Eusebius demanded justice for the evils which Dioscorus had done to himself and Flavianus of Constantinople; he charged him with having favoured Eutyches in every thing; with having made use of notorious violence and the most unworthy means, in order to procure the absolution of Eutyches. He then required that the acts of the pseudo-council of Ephesus should be read, by which he hoped to show the injustice of Dioscorus in deposing Flavianus and himself. In the course of reading many passages occurred highly injurious to Theodoret, which induced the emperor to order, by his officers, that he should enter, and take his place in the council, but the Egyptians, with great tumult, refused to allow this, saying that such an act would be to overthrow the faith, and that he must remain in the sole character of an accuser.

Many of the Oriental bishops also interrupted the reading of these acts with exclamations about the violence which they had suffered from Dioscorus, and when the latter pleaded in excuse that all that had passed at the council was with the consent of those present, the bishops exclaimed with vehemence against his assertion, declaring that they had been forced, and even beaten, and threatened with banishment, that soldiers had repulsed them when they desired to depart, and that they had, in short, been compelled to sign a blank paper.

After this, the acts of the council of Constantinople were read, which were inserted in those of the pseudo-council of Ephesus. Amongst others they read the second letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius, and that which he had written to the Eastern Church; these being ended, the bishops unanimously exclaimed that they contained their own belief and their own doctrine, and as Flavianus had approved these two letters in the council of Constantinople, the legates, with Maximus of Antioch and Eustachius of Berythus, declared that in their opinion the faith of Flavianus was strictly in accordance with the true faith and the letter of Cyril. The Eastern

Chalcedon, 451. bishops, also, with one voice, agreed that Flavianus had truly asserted the Catholic faith, and at the same time the bishops of Palestine passed over from the right hand to the side on the left of the imperial officer, to testify that they abandoned the Egyptian party, so that in the end Dioscorus was left with about twelve bishops.

Thus the innocence of Flavianus was established, and, at the same time, necessarily, the pseudo-council of Ephesus condemned. None of the bishops who had taken any share in the proceedings attempting to defend themselves. But although every one declared himself in favour of Flavianus, Dioscorus did not in the slightest degree abate his arrogance, declaring, that for his part he belonged to no party, and professed no faith but the Catholic and apostolic faith, neither did he regard men, but God alone.

After this, the opinion which Eustachius of Berythus had delivered at the council of Ephesus, came under consideration, maintaining that it is an error to believe in two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the right faith is, that there is in Him but one nature incarnate. This opinion was unanimously condemned. In the third place the confession of Eutyches, which had been approved by Dioscorus at the council of Ephesus, was read in it: he declared his belief that in our Lord were two natures before his incarnation, and but *one* afterwards. This opinion was at once anathematized by the fathers in council, and when the sentence which Dioscorus had pronounced against Flavianus had been read, they proceeded to anathematize Dioscorus himself; and with one voice demanded that he, together with Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustachius of Berythus, and Basil of Seleucia, who had presided at the council, should be deposed from the episcopate.

On this day the acts of the 1st session only of the pseudo-council at Ephesus were read.

II. Session. The second session begun on the 10th October. On this occasion Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, and Basil were absent. The bishops were now entreated on the part of the emperor to decide matters relating to the faith, in order to settle the minds of those who have been led astray; they replied that a new exposition of the faith was not needed, but that the fathers had left a sufficient exposition of the true faith, which they ought

to follow, and that the letter of S. Leo, which all the bishops in council had already subscribed, was a sufficient antidote to the heresy of Eutyches. Chalcedon, 451.

However, the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople were read, and also the letter of S. Leo to Flavianus, in which the doctrine of the incarnation was admirably developed. The doctrine which it taught is as follows: "The divine nature and the human nature, each remaining perfect, have been united in one person, to the intent that the same Mediator might die, being yet immortal and impassible. . . . . Neither nature is altered by the other; He who is truly God is also truly man. . . . . The Word and the flesh preserve each its proper functions. Holy Scripture proves equally the verity of the two natures. He is *God*, since it is written, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word *was God*.' He is also *man*, since it is written, 'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' As *man*, He was tempted by the devil; as God, He is ministered unto by angels. As man, He wept over the tomb of Lazarus; as God, He raised him from the dead. As man He is nailed to the cross; as God He makes all nature tremble at His death. It is by reason of the unity of person that we say that the Son of Man came down from Heaven, and that the Son of God was crucified and buried, although He was so only as to His human nature."

This exposition of the faith was approved by all the bishops, and anathema declared against all who should deny it.

After this, the bishops of Illyria and Palestine earnestly demanded that pardon should be granted to the chiefs of the pseudo-council at Ephesus, specially naming Dioscorus. The eastern bishops, however, without taking notice of the others, insisted upon the banishment of Dioscorus.

The third session was held on the 13th of October, at which the officers of the emperor were not present; probably, as Tillemont says, in order that it might not be said, that the bishops were not permitted to pass a free judgment upon Dioscorus. III. Session.

The petition of Eusebius was read, in which he demanded, that Dioscorus, having now been convicted of many crimes, the council should anathematize his impious dogmas; that it should punish him according to

Chalcedon, 451. his deserts; that it should confirm the true faith, and annul all that had been done in the false council of Ephesus; he also requested that Dioscorus should be cited before the council to answer him, and this was accordingly done; but Dioscorus, upon various pretexts, refused to appear. The petitions of the clergy and laity of Alexandria against Dioscorus were then read, in which they accused him of grievous crimes, stating that he had been guilty of homicide, had burnt and pulled down houses, had lived an infamous life, had bought up corn in order to enhance the price, and had connived at the residence of women of ill-fame in his diocese, and had even kept them in his own home. After this, Dioscorus was cited a third time to appear, but with as little success as before; and the deputies having made their report to the council, the legate, in a few words, enumerated the crimes of which Dioscorus had been convicted, and declared him to be deprived by themselves, acting for the pope, and by the council, of his episcopal office, and of all his ecclesiastical dignities. After this, they requested the council to make a decree conformable to the canons of the Church, and accordingly, each of the bishops present, with a loud voice, condemned Dioscorus, and the sentence being committed to writing, they all signed it; the whole number of signatures amounting to three hundred. They then drew up an act to signify to Dioscorus the judgment passed against him, and a letter to the emperor, informing him of the causes which compelled them to depose the former; lastly, his deposition was gravely pronounced irrevocable, and soon after he was banished to Gangra, in Paphlagonia, where, in the course of three years, he died.

IV. Session. At the fourth session, October 17, the emperor's officers were again present, and perceiving that the bishops were averse to drawing up any new definition of the faith, they contented themselves with demanding whether they received the letter of S. Leo as agreeing with the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople. At the request of the bishop, Paschasinus declared it to be the faith of the council, and that they held to the definition of Nicea, and that of Constantinople, under Theodosius, as also to the exposition of S. Cyril, and to the writings of S. Leo against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches.

After this, the bishops, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil, and Eustachius, having made open profession of the true faith, were absolved by the unanimous vote of the council, which considered that the deposition of Dioscorus ought to suffice, and that matters should not be pushed too far, for fear of originating a fresh schism. Chalcedon, 451.

Some other matters of minor importance were also transacted in this session.

Fifth session, October 22. Although the bishops had before expressed an unwillingness to draw up any new definition of the faith, they, upon further consideration, resolved to do so, endeavouring, however, to follow exactly all that had previously been decided by the fathers. They resolved that the definition of the faith as to the matter in question, should be examined into, and they appointed a committee of twenty-two, who assembled in the oratory of S. Euphemia. Having accordingly examined the existing definition of the faith, they proceeded to draw up a new form, in which, however, several bishops objected to the expression, that Jesus Christ was *of* two natures, and not *in* two natures, which, although strictly speaking *true*, yet was such a definition as the Eutychians could have received as well as the Catholics; after many difficulties and much discussion, they agreed to follow exactly the letter of S. Leo, and the decree containing the definition was accordingly altered, and, in the end, accepted by the whole Church. This decree is not in the form of a creed, brief and abridged, but rather of a long discourse, in which both the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds are inserted; the two letters of S. Cyril against Nestorius were added to it, and also that of S. Leo to Flavianus against the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches; the council itself added a brief statement of the true faith, in respect to the incarnation, of which the following are the most important articles :— V. Session.

"We confess and with one accord teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in the divinity, perfect in the humanity, truly God and truly Man, consisting of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father, according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us, according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, sin only excepted: who was begotten of the Father before all ages, according to the Godhead; and in the last days, the same was born ac-

Chalcedon, 451.

cording to the Manhood, of Mary the Virgin, Mother of God, for us and for our salvation: who is to be acknowledged one and the same Christ, the Son, the Lord, the only begotten in two natures, without mixture, change, division, or separation; the difference of natures not being removed by their union, but rather the propriety of each nature being preserved and concurring in one person and in one ὑπόστασις, so that He is not divided or separated into *two persons*, but the only Son, God, the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, and one and the same person."

When this decree was read, the bishops, with one voice, cried out that it contained the faith of the fathers, and it was unanimously received by them, to the number of three hundred and fifty-six. The council then forbade any one to hold or teach any other faith, upon pain, if a bishop or clergyman, of being deposed, if a monk or layman, of being anathematized.

VI. Session.

At the sixth session, October 25, the emperor was present in person, and delivered a speech in Latin, in which he unfolded what had been his intentions in convoking the council, and declared that his sole motive in attending it was to give his assistance in settling the true faith, and not at all to hinder the freedom of their deliberations. Then the above-mentioned decree was read, upon which the emperor asked if the council was agreed as to this confession, and the bishops unanimously declaring that they were so, severally subscribed it.

This done, the emperor declared his will that the city of Chalcedon, in which the council had been held, should thenceforward enjoy the privileges of a metropolitan see; saving the dignity of the metropolitan of Nicomedia.

VII. Sess.

In the seventh session the arrangements which Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, had made upon certain disputes connected with their sees, were ratified.

VIII. Sess.

In the eighth session Theodoret was re-established in his church, having pronounced anathema against Nestorius, and subscribed the letter of Leo.

IX. Sess.

In the ninth session the case of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, was considered, who complained of having been persecuted by Eutyches, and deposed in the pseudo-council of Ephesus in his absence.

These three sessions appear to have been held on the same day, viz. October 26. Chalcedon, 451.

In the tenth session, October 27, Ibas was pronounced to be orthodox, and his re-establishment in his see ordered. X. Session.

In the eleventh session, October 29, Bassianus, bishop of Ephesus, was declared to have intruded into that see, having obtained his chair by violence; and Stephen, who also pretended to the same bishopric, was similarly condemned: it was, therefore, decreed, that it was necessary to proceed to a fresh election. XI. Session.

In the twelfth session, October 30, it was decreed, that although Stephen and Bassianus should be deprived of the see of Ephesus, the rank of bishop should not be taken from them, and that they should receive a maintenance out of the revenues of that Church. XII. Sess.

In the thirteenth session, on the same day, it was decreed that the bishop of Nicomedia should have the *authority* of metropolitan over the churches of Bithynia, and that the bishop of Nicea should have metropolitan *honour* only, and submit to the see of Nicomedia. XIII. Sess.

In the fourteenth session, October 31, judgment was pronounced in the difference between Sabianus, bishop of Perea, in Syria, and Anastasius, who was also bishop of the same city, but who had been deposed, and afterwards replaced in the chair; it was ordered that Anastasius should continue to enjoy the see in peace until the matter should be thoroughly sifted by Maximus of Antioch in a synod. XIV. Sess.

In this session, October 31, twenty-eight canons were published. XV. Sess.

1. Confirms all canons before made by the fathers in different councils; [answering to the code of the whole Church, or rather of the Greek Church, published by Justel, and containing one hundred and seventy canons, taken from the councils of Nicea, Ancyra, Neo-Cesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, and Constantinople.]

2. Declares that if a bishop shall receive any money, &c., in consideration of conferring orders, both he himself and the person so ordained shall be deposed; and that any person acting in any way as the intermediate party on the occasion shall, if a clerk, be deposed; if a monk or layman, be anathematized.

3. Forbids any ecclesiastic or monk to undertake the management or stewardship of the property of others,

Canons of Chalcedon.

or intrude himself into worldly ministrations. Amongst a few other exceptions, however, it is permitted to them to undertake the care of the property of orphans and widows, and other afflicted persons, with the bishop's consent.

4. Forbids the erection of any monastery or oratory without the permission of the bishop of the diocese. Orders all monks to submit to the bishop of the diocese, and not to meddle in any ecclesiastical or civil matters, unless they be permitted to do so for some necessary purpose by their bishop. Lastly, orders all bishops to keep watch over the conduct of the monks within their dioceses; offenders to be excommunicated.

Nicea, Canon 15.

5. Renews the prohibition made in a former council, forbidding the bishop or clergy of one church to quit their own church in order to go and serve in another.

6. Forbids a bishop to ordain a clerk unless he is, *bonâ fide*, intended to serve in some particular church, or chapel, or monastery, and declares all ordinations not made in accordance with this law to be null and void.

7. Forbids, under pain of anathema, those who have been ordained, or who have entered a state of monkhood, to quit their state.

8. Enjoins the clergy attached to all monasteries, chapels of martyrs, hospitals, &c., to submit to their bishops: offenders to be excommunicated.

9. Orders that all disputes between the clergy shall be settled before their bishop, and in no secular court, except by his permission. That if a dispute arise between a bishop and one of the clergy, it shall be judged in the provincial council. That all disputes between a bishop or clergyman and his metropolitan, shall be brought before the exarch of the diocese [i. e. the patriarch] or the bishop of Constantinople.

10. Absolutely forbids a clergyman to be on the list of the church of two cities at the same time, and orders that such as act thus, shall be restored to the church in which they were first ordained.

11[3]. Orders that letters of peace (or of communion)

[3] In the version of Dionysius Exiguus the canon is to this effect: "That letters of peace shall be given to poor persons going abroad, and not letters commendatory; because that letters commendatory are to be given only to more honourable persons."

be given to poor persons going abroad, after examination; and that letters commendatory be given to those persons only who are liable to suspicion. Canons of Chalcedon.

12. Forbids any bishop, under pain of deposition, to divide the province, by obtaining letters-patent from the emperor, erecting his bishopric into a metropolitan see.

13. Forbids that a foreign or unknown ecclesiastic be permitted to exercise any function in the church, except he bring letters commendatory from his bishop.

14. Forbids the lower orders of ecclesiastics (readers, chanters, &c.), to whom it was permitted to marry, to marry Jewesses, or pagan, or heretical women, except they should promise to become Christians.

15. Forbids the ordination of a deaconness under forty years of age; if after ordination she shall marry, she shall be anathematized with her husband.

16. Orders that virgins marrying after having consecrated themselves to God, be separated from communion for as long a period as the bishop shall deem proper.

17. Makes over to the bishop for ever parishes in the country over which he has exercised jurisdiction for thirty years.

18. Deposes those of the clergy or monks, who form cabals against their bishop or any of their fellow clergy.

19. Renews the decree of the council of Nicea, which directs that provincial councils be held twice in every year; and enjoins, that bishops who wilfully neglect to attend shall be reproved. Nicea C.

20. Directs that if any bishop shall receive a clergyman belonging to another bishop, both the bishop and the clergyman shall be separated from communion until the said clergyman shall return to his own bishop.

21. Forbids the receiving an accusation against a clergyman from any person without first inquiring into his character.

22. Forbids the clergy to take possession of the property of their bishop after his decease[4], under pain of losing their rank.

23. Directs that the defender of the Church of Con-

[4] It appears to have been not an uncommon practice at that time, not only for the clergy, but even for the laity, to seize upon the property of their bishop after his death.

Canons of Chalcedon.

stantinople shall drive out of the city all strange clergy or monks, coming there without letters from their bishop, and causing trouble and disturbance.

24. Orders that houses which have once been erected into monasteries, and consecrated, shall ever after be devoted to the same purpose.

25. Directs that the metropolitan shall consecrate to a vacant bishopric within three months after the death of the bishop.

26. Directs that in every diocese there shall be a steward (œconomus) chosen from amongst the clergy, who shall manage the property of the Church according to the bishop's directions.

27. Anathematizes those who have been guilty of rape or abduction, and all who have aided and abetted in those crimes, or who have consented to them; if any one of the clergy be amongst the guilty, he shall be deposed.

28. "We, following in all things the decisions of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops, which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the fathers properly gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the one hundred and fifty most religious bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of new Rome; judging, with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome, should also be magnified, like her, in ecclesiastical matters, and be second after her. And (we decree) that the metropolitans only of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses, and, moreover, the bishops of the aforesaid dioceses who are amongst the barbarians, shall be ordained by the above-mentioned throne of the most holy church of Constantinople; each metropolitan of the aforesaid dioceses ordaining the bishops of the provinces, as has been declared by the divine canons; but the metropolitans themselves of the said dioceses shall, as has been said, be ordained by the bishop of Constantinople, the proper elections being made according to custom, and reported to him."

Canons of Chalcedon.

It appears that the Roman legates had refused to be present when this last canon was carried; however, immediately after they called for an assembly of the council, and protested against it, alleging that it was contrary to the sixth canon of the council of Nicea, which, as they asserted, commenced with these words, "The Roman see hath always had the primacy;" this, however, was shown to be only an interpolation [5], and after it had been proved that all things had been done rightly and canonically, the imperial judges delivered their opinion, which was to the effect, that granting to the bishop of ancient Rome, according to the canons, the primacy and prerogative of *honour*, the bishop of Constantinople ought nevertheless to enjoy the same ecclesiastical *privileges* of honour, and that he should have the right of consecrating metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. The bishops having then declared their entire concurrence in this opinion, and denied the assertion of the legates, viz. that they (the bishops) had been *compelled* to sign the twenty-eighth canon, the officers pronounced the decision, that the twenty-eighth canon must stand, declaring that the council had confirmed all that had been proposed. This was the last act of the council of Chalcedon [6].

Leo constantly opposed this twenty-eighth canon, upon the plea that it contradicted the sixth of Nicea, which assigned the second place in dignity to Alexandria; however, in spite of his opposition and that of his successors, the canon remained and was executed.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1—1003.

Chalons-sur-Saone, 649.

CHALONS. [*Concilium Cabilonense.*] Held in 649, by order of Clovis II.; present, thirty-nine bishops, the deputies of six who were absent, six abbots, and one archdeacon. Agapius and Bobonus, bishops of Digne in Provence [7], were here deposed from the episcopate for violation of the canons. The council also

[5] This reading appears only in one Latin version, all the Greek copies and all other versions unite in giving this canon as it is usually read, viz. "Let the ancient customs be maintained," &c.

[6] The Greek copies have two more canons:—

29. Declares it to be sacrilege to degrade a bishop to the rank of priest; but if for any just cause he shall be deposed from the episcopal office, he must also be deposed from the priesthood.

30. Relates to the case of the Egyptian bishops, who prayed for time before subscribing to the letter of S. Leo.

[7] "Diniensis urbis episcopos."

drew up twenty canons. The first orders that the true faith, as taught by the council of Nicea and confirmed by that of Chalcedon, be observed. The fourth forbids the consecration of more than one bishop to the same Church at the same time. The fifth forbids the laity to meddle in the administration of churches and church property. The fourteenth directs that the clergy who serve chapels shall be subject to the bishop in all things. The sixteenth is directed against simony. The nineteenth inflicts penalties upon lascivious dancers, and women who sang immodest songs within the church enclosure, on saints' days and festivals of dedication.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 387.

Chalons, 813.

CHALONS. Held in 813, by order of Charlemagne, for the reformation of the Church and clergy. This council was assembled from all Gaul Lyonnoise (except the province of Tours, which met in a separate synod). Sixty-six canons were published.

The first eleven relate to bishops, and direct that they shall read the Holy Scriptures, the Councils, and the Pastoral of S. Gregory; that they shall preach to their people and edify them, establish schools, abstain from all shameful means of gain, &c. &c. &c. The twelfth forbids priests, deacons, or monks to become farmers. Fourteenth and fifteenth forbid ordinaries to put their clergy to any expence during their visitations. The twenty-seventh forbids the repetition of confirmation. The thirty-second declares that spiritual sins must be confessed, as well as bodily sins. The thirty-fifth censures those who, when forbidden wine and meat, as a penance, make up for them by indulging in other delicacies and delicious drinks. Thirty-sixth declares that almsgiving avails only to release from venial sins, arising from frailty, and reproves those who go on in sin, thinking to escape punishment for their much almsgiving. Thirty-ninth orders prayers for the dead to be said at every mass, and declares it to be an ancient custom in the church to commend to the Lord the spirits of those asleep. Forty-third declares the ordination of certain priests and deacons conferred by certain Scotch persons calling themselves bishops to be null and void, being done without the consent of their diocesans, and with suspicion of simony. Forty-fifth condemns pilgrimages made in order to obtain remission of sins, which, on that pretext, the persons about to make the pilgrimage

go on committing more freely; pilgrimages made from proper devotional motives are commended. Forty-seventh orders all Christians to receive the holy eucharist on Maundy Thursday.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1270.

CHALONS. Held in 1062, by Peter d'Amien, cardinal and legate, at the head of thirteen bishops. The subject of the council was the confirmation of the privileges of the abbey of Clugny, which Drogon, bishop of Maçon, had attacked. Peace was restored between him and the abbot.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1177. Chalons, 1062.

CHARROUX. [*Concilium Karrofense.*] Held about 989, by six bishops. Three canons were published. 1. Excommunicates those who break into churches, or carry away any thing out of them. 2. Excommunicates those who rob the poor. 3. Those who lay violent hands upon the clergy.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 733. Charroux, 989.

CHARROUX. Held in 1028, against the Manichæans, by William, duke of Aquitaine.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 860. Charroux, 1028.

CHARTRES. Held on the third Sunday after Easter, 1146, at which all the French bishops were present, together with the king, Louis VII. The object was to arrange matters relating to the crusade, and to persuade S. Bernard to accept the office of leader, which, however, he constantly refused. (See C. Vezelai, 1146.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1102. Chartres, 1146.

CHATEAUX GONTIER, in Anjou. [*Concilium apud Castrum Gontherii.*] Held in 1231, by the archbishop of Tours and his suffragans, who published thirty-seven canons or regulations, of which the following are of most consequence. The first against clandestine marriages, ordering that those persons who have been so united be separated. 3. Exacts an oath from every clerk presented to a benefice, to the effect that he had neither directly nor indirectly given or promised any thing in return. 4. Orders the bishops to see that all beneficed clerks serve their own cures. 9. Forbids communicants to communicate with excommunicated persons. 10. Forbids the frequent use of general excommunication. 15. Deprives patrons who present unfit persons of their patronage. 16. Forbids to present to a living any one ignorant of the language of the place. 24, and some others relate to the conduct of monks. 30. Orders the sentence of excommunication against usurers to be read every Sunday. 33. Forbids Châteaux Gontier, in Anjou, 1231.

to receive the testimony of Jews against Christians.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 438.

Chichester, 1157. CHICHESTER. [*Concilium Cicestrense.*] Held at Whitsuntide 1157, concerning the privileges of the Abbey "de Bello," i. e. Battle Abbey, founded by William the Conqueror, who (it was alleged by the abbot, but disputed by the bishop of Chichester,) had founded it to be "free and at ease from all claim of servitude, and from all subjection, oppression, and domination of bishops, as is Christ Church, Canterbury."—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1176; *Wilkins*, Conc. vol. i. p. 428.

Chichester, 1289. CHICHESTER. Held in 1289, under Gilbert, bishop of Chichester. In this council forty-one canons were drawn up.

1 and 2. Recommends to all curates, prayer and reading, humility, continence, and all the evangelical virtues, and forbids them to attend plays, tournaments, indecent shows, and taverns.

4. Sentences those curates who shall seduce their own parishioners to perpetual imprisonment in some monastery, after having first made a penitential pilgrimage during fifteen years.

8. Imposes a fine of sixty shillings, to be applied towards the fabric of the cathedral at Chichester, upon all those who appoint to the care of a parish priests who are notorious fornicators, or who are convicted or suspected of incontinence.

9. Relates to the priestly garments.

10. Orders that well-informed and pious men only be made curates.

15. Orders that the hours be said by the priests at the appointed times, and in such a manner as to minister to edification and true religion.

16. Directs that the priests shall visit the sick on every Sunday and festival, and administer the sacraments to them in their own houses at their own hour. It forbids also (what some had presumed to do) the sending of the eucharist to the rich by the hands of a deacon, while they are themselves indulging in drinking or other carnal pleasures.

19. Declares that neither the viaticum nor burial is to be refused on account of secret crimes.

20. Forbids every curate to receive confession or administer the communion to strange parishioners without the leave of their own curate, or of the pope.

21. Forbids all mention of *tithes*, or other temporal affairs, during the time of confession.

22. Orders that the communion be administered at Easter, and that no money be taken for so doing.

29. Orders that all churches be provided with suitable vessels, books, and ornaments; and that the *font* and the chrism be kept under lock and key.

33. Directs that the monks shall present to the bishop those monks whom they desire to appoint to parishes belonging to them.

37 and 38. Relate to marriages.

39. Condemns false preachers, who, without lawful mission, preached and received confession for the sake of gain.

40 and 41. Excommunicates church plunderers, calumniators, &c. &c. &c.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 169; Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1346.

Chichester, 1292.

CHICHESTER. Held in 1292, by the same prelate; here seven canons were published.

1. Forbids the permitting any animals, except tithe lambs, and those for fifteen days only, to feed in churchyards.

2. Forbids any restraint upon voluntary offerings made by the people to the Church.

3. Excommunicates, *ipso facto*, those who retain the tithe.

4. Orders silence and decent behaviour in church.

5. Forbids indiscriminate burial within the church; the lord of the manor, and the patron, with their wives, the rector, and the curate, are excepted.

6. Forbids the putting up an alms-box in the church without the bishop's permission.

7. Directs that these regulations shall be published four times in each year.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1361. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 183.

Cilicia, 423.

CILICIA. [*Concilium Ciliciense.*] Held in 423, against the Pelagian heresy. Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was considered as one of the heads of this heresy, himself pronounced anathema against Julian, who had before retired to him, in order to write his eight books against S. Augustin, and whom the latter had crushed by his writings.—*Mercator Marius*, p. 219.

Cirta, in Numidia, 305 or 303.

CIRTA, (in Numidia.) [*Concilium Cirtense.*] Held in 305 (or 303), to fill up the vacant bishopric of Cirta. Secundus, the primate of Numidia, presided, and drew

from eleven or twelve of the bishops present, a confession that they had been guilty of betraying the sacred books during the persecution. The better to understand their crime, it must be borne in mind that, during the Diocletian persecution, an edict was promulgated, ordering the destruction of the churches [8], and obliging the magistrates every where to take from the bishops and priests of the Church their copies of the Holy Scriptures. This edict was executed with the greatest rigour in Numidia; the magistrates themselves entered into the churches, and into the houses of the bishops and clergy, to search for the Scriptures, that they might burn them, threatening with the penalty of death all who refused to discover them. Many of the Christians were content to suffer any torment, and death itself, rather than betray them; but there were also many not merely among the lower orders of ecclesiastics, but also among the priests, and even bishops, who, through fear of death, were guilty of delivering up the sacred volumes: such were styled "*Traditores.*" At Cirta there were, unhappily, many bishops and others of the clergy, who had given a miserable example of cowardice. After that the bishops had confessed their sin in the council, Secundus gave them absolution.

Silvanus, a sub-deacon, who had also been a Traditor, was elected to the bishopric.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 936.

Cirta, 412. CIRTA. Held in 412, in the month of June, under Silvanus, primate of Numidia, assisted by several bishops of the province and S. Augustin, upon the subject of the Donatists, who, finding themselves entirely worsted in the conference of Carthage, spread abroad a report, to cover the shame of their defeat, that Marcellinus, the judge of the conference, had been bribed by the Catholics, and that the Donatists had not been permitted a fair hearing. The fathers wrote a letter, dictated by S. Augustin, in which these calumnies are refuted.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1518.

Clarendon, 1164. CLARENDON. [*Concilium Clarendonense.*] Held on the 25th of January, 1164. This was not, strictly speaking, an ecclesiastical synod, since, besides the two archbishops, and twelve bishops, there were present, the king and thirty-nine lay barons. Here the king laid

[8] This very assembly was held in a private house, because the churches were not restored.

before them certain laws, which he called the "Customs of England;" most of these customs, (especially the twelfth,) were, in fact, nothing else than infringements upon the then existing rights and privileges of the Church; they were as follow: Clarendon, 1164.

1. All suits concerning advowsons and presentations, &c., to be prosecuted in the civil courts.

2. Churches which are fees of the crown, not to be granted in perpetuity without the king's consent.

3. Clergy accused of any crime to be prosecuted in the civil courts, and in case of conviction, to forfeit the immunity of their character, and be protected by the Church no longer.

4. No clergyman, especially if of rank, to leave the country without the king's licence, and to give security that during his stay abroad he will solicit nothing to the prejudice of the king or kingdom.

5. The laity not to be prosecuted in ecclesiastical courts, except by legal and reputable witnesses.

6. Excommunicated persons not to be bound to give security for remaining in their present places of abode.

7. No chief tenant of the crown to be excommunicated without the king's consent.

8. All appeals in spiritual causes to be carried from the archdeacon to the bishop, thence to the primate, and from him to the king, by whose order the cause to be finally tried in the archbishop's court; no farther appeal allowed without the king's leave.

9. In case of any dispute between a layman and clergyman, concerning a tenement which the latter declares to be holden by frank almoine[9], and the possession to be a lay fee, if it prove upon trial, before twelve reputable men, to be a *lay* fee, and not an ecclesiastical fee, the cause to be finally tried in the civil court.

10. No one residing on the demesne lands of the crown, or holding of the king, to be excommunicated for non-appearance in a spiritual court, until the matter be notified to the king's chief officer in the place where he resides, that he may compel him by civil authority to give satisfaction to the Church.

11. Archbishops, bishops, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, holding of the king in chief, to be regarded as barons of the realm, and bound to bear the burdens

[9] "*Frank almoine*," i. e. a tenure by divine service.—*Britton.*

belonging to their rank, and to attend the king in council, &c.

12. The revenues of every archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, during a vacancy, to belong to the king; and the election to be made by such members of the chapter as he is pleased to summon for that purpose to court; the election to be made in the chapel royal, with the consent of the king, and by the advice of such persons of the government as he shall think fit to consult.

13. If any baron or tenant *in capite* should encroach upon the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, the king to employ his authority in compelling him to make restitution and satisfaction; if, on the other hand, any of them should throw off their allegiance to the king, or encroach upon his lands, &c., the bishops to assist the king with spiritual censures.

14. No goods forfeited to the king to be forfeited in churches or churchyards.

15. The clergy not to attempt to enforce the payment of debts contracted on oath or promise; such cases to be determined by the civil courts.

16. Sons of copyholders not to be ordained without the consent of their lord.

Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury, to the utmost of his power, resisted these encroachments; but the other bishops, being overawed by the presence and threats of the lay barons, yielded; and finally the archbishop signed the constitutions, and promised, "with good faith and without reserve to observe them." Immediately afterwards, when liberty of action was given to him, he revoked his assent, and appealed to the pope. The king, not daring openly to impeach him, accused him of not appearing in person to a summons served upon him, and sentenced him to confiscation of all his goods; after this, Becket retired into France, where he remained six years, during which time Henry enjoyed the revenues of the see of Canterbury, as well as the plunder of many of the archbishop's friends, whom he fined heavily for assisting him in his distress.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1425. See also *Churton's Early English Church*, chap. 18. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 435.

Clermont, 535. Same with Council of Auvergne.

CLERMONT. [*Concilium Claromontanum* (or *Arvernense*).] Held on the 8th of November, 535; Honoratus, archbishop of Bourges, presiding over

fourteen other bishops. Sixteen canons were published.

The second deprives of communion those who endeavour to get themselves appointed to bishoprics by the influence of persons in high station, or by artifice or bribery; and declares that those persons shall be consecrated who have been duly elected by the clergy and people, with consent of the metropolitan. The eighth forbids to lend the ornaments of the church upon occasion of wedding festivities, and the like. Fifteenth directs that the priests who serve chapels in the country shall come together to celebrate the principal festivals with their bishop.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1803.

Clermont, 1095.

CLERMONT. Held in November, 1095, by pope Urban II., at the head of thirteen archbishops, two hundred and five bishops and abbots. Here the crusade was determined upon. Philip I. king of France, who had deserted his lawful wife, and married Bertrade, was a second time excommunicated. The "Treve de Dieu" was confirmed, as was the primacy of Lyons: the archbishop of Tours, also, in this council recovered his jurisdiction over Bretagne, and the bishop of Dol, who had the title of archbishop, was compelled to submit to the archbishop of Tours. Lastly, thirty-two canons were published.

1. Declares the days upon which the "Treve de Dieu" shall be kept, and orders that it shall be observed towards the clergy, monks, and women.

2. Declares that the pilgrimage to deliver Jerusalem, undertaken from motives of piety, supplies the place of every other penance.

5. Forbids to appoint laymen, and every one under the order of sub-deacon, to bishoprics.

6. Forbids the purchase of a benefice of any kind by any person for himself or another; orders that benefices so purchased shall lapse to the bishop to dispose of.

8. Forbids the exaction of any fee for burials.

10. Forbids any women, save those permitted by former canons, to dwell in the same house with a clergyman.

11. Forbids the ordination of illegitimates.

12 and 14. Forbid pluralities.

15 and 16. Forbid the clergy to receive any ecclesiastical preferment at the hand of a layman, and kings, &c., to make any such investiture.

18. Forbids the laity to have chaplains independent of the bishop.

23. Forbids to eat flesh from Ash-Wednesday to Easter.

24. Directs that holy orders shall be conferred only in the Ember seasons and on Quadragesima Sunday.

28 [1]. Directs that all who communicate shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ *under both kinds*, unless there be necessity to the contrary.

29 and 30. Accord the same safety to those who, when pursued by their enemies, take refuge by a cross, as if in the church itself.

32. Devotes to eternal infamy those who arrest or throw into prison a bishop.

However, of all the acts of this council the most celebrated is the publication of the crusade to recover the Holy Land. This project was conceived by Gregory VII.; and Urban, yielding to the earnest entreaties of Peter the hermit, put it into execution; declaring that all penitents who assumed the cross, should be thenceforward absolved from all their sins, and freed from the duty of fasting, and every other penitential work, in consideration of the perils and fatigues they would have to encounter. Those who, having taken the cross failed to fulfil their vow, were excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 506.

Cloves-hoo, or Cliff's-hoe, 742.

CLOVES-HOO (or CLIFF'S-HOE). [*Concilium Clovehonense.*] Held in 742; Ethelbald [2], king of the Mercians, and Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, presiding. Several bishops attended, and diligent inquiry was made how matters relating to religion, and particularly to the creed, were ordered in the infancy of the Church of England, and in what esteem monasteries then were.

The ordinance of king Wihtred concerning the election and authority of the heads of monasteries, made in the council of Becanceld, A. D. 692, was read, and renewed by Ethelbald in these words:

[1] "Ne quis communicet de altari nisi Corpus separatim et Sanguinem similiter sumat, nisi per necessitatem et per cautelam."

[2] "Ethelbald probably acted as a sort of chairman; but as the business was entirely ecclesiastical, the lead most likely was taken by Cuthbert, the archbishop."—*Soames, Hist. of Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 103, *note*.

"I, Ethelbald, king of the Mercians, for the health of my soul and the stability of my kingdom, and out of reverence to the venerable archbishop Cuthbert, confirm it by the subscription of my own munificent hand, that the liberty, honour, authority, and security of the Church of Christ be contradicted by no man; but that she and all the lands belonging to her, be free from all secular services, except military expedition, and the building of a bridge or castle. And we charge that this be irrefragably and immutably observed by all, as the aforesaid king Wihtred ordained for him and his."—*Johnson's Ecc. Canon.* Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1532. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 86.

CLOVES-HOO. Held in the beginning of September, 747, in the presence of Ethelbald, king of the Mercians, Cuthbert of Canterbury presiding; eleven bishops and several priests attended. Two letters from pope Zachary were read, after which thirty canons were drawn up. Cloves-hoo, 747.

1. Charges every bishop to be ready to defend his pastoral charge, and the canonical institutions of the Church of Christ with his utmost endeavours, and to be an example of good, not of worldliness, to his people, and to preach sound doctrine.

2. Exhorts bishops to unity and charity amongst themselves, so that, however far distant in sees, they may yet be joined together in mind by one spirit, serving God in faith, hope, and charity, and praying for each other.

3. Orders annual episcopal visitations, and directs the bishop to call the people of every condition together to convenient places, and to plainly teach them, and forbid them all pagan and superstitious observances, &c.

4. Directs bishops to exhort all abbots and abbesses within their dioceses to exhibit a good example in their lives, and to rule well their houses.

5. Orders bishops to visit those monasteries which, owing to the corruption of the times, were governed by laymen.

6. Directs due inquiry to be made concerning the good life and sound faith of candidates for priest's orders.

7. Directs bishops, abbots, and abbesses to take care that their "families" do incessantly apply their minds to reading.

Cloves-hoo, 747.

8. Exhorts priests to the right discharge of their duty; to desist from secular business; to serve at the altar with the utmost application; carefully to preserve the house of prayer and its furniture; to spend their time in reading, celebrating masses, and psalmody, &c.

9. Exhorts priests, in the places assigned to them by their bishops, to attend to the duties of the apostolical commission, in baptizing, teaching, and visiting, and carefully to abstain from all wicked and ridiculous conversation.

10. Directs that priests should learn how to perform, according to the lawful rites, every office belonging to their order; that they shall also learn to construe and explain in their native tongue the Lord's Prayer and creed, and the sacred words used at mass and in holy baptism; that they shall understand the spiritual signification of the sacraments, &c.

11. Relates to the faith held by priests, orders that it shall be sound and sincere, and that their ministrations shall be uniform; that they shall teach all men that "without faith it is impossible to please God;" that they shall instil the creed into them, and propose it to infants and their sponsors.

12. Forbids priests "to prate in church," and "to dislocate or confound the composure and distinction of the sacred words" by theatrical pronunciation; directs them to follow the "plain song" according to the custom of the Church; or, if they cannot do that, simply to read the words. Also forbids priests to presume to interfere in episcopal functions.

13. Orders the due observation of the festivals of our Lord and Saviour, and of the nativity of the saints, according to the Roman martyrology.

14. Orders the due observation of the Lord's day.

15. Orders that the seven canonical hours of prayer be diligently observed.

16. Orders that the Litanies or rogations be kept by the clergy and people, with great reverence, on St. Mark's day, and on the three days preceding Ascension day.

17. Orders the observance of the "birth-days" of pope Gregory, of S. Augustin of Canterbury, who "first brought the knowledge of faith, the sacrament of baptism, and the notice of the heavenly country," to the English nation.

18. Orders the observance of the Ember fasts in the fourth, seventh, and tenth months[3], according to the Roman ritual.

19. Relates to the behaviour and dress of monks and nuns.

20. Charges bishops to take care that monasteries, as their name imports, be honest retreats for the silent and quiet, not receptacles for versifiers, harpers, and buffoons; forbids too much familiarity with laymen, especially to nuns; bids the latter not spend their time in filthy talk, junketting, drunkenness, luxury, nor in making vestments of divers and vain-glorious colours, but rather in reading books and singing psalms.

21. Enjoins all monks and ecclesiastics to avoid the sin of drunkenness, and forbids them to help themselves to drink before three in the afternoon, except in cases of necessity.

22. Admonishes monks and ecclesiastics to keep themselves always prepared to receive the holy communion.

23. Encourages boys among the laity to receive frequently the communion, while they are not yet corrupted; also bachelors and married men who avoid sin, lest they grow weak for want of the salutary meat and drink.

24. Orders that laymen be well tried before they be admitted into the ecclesiastical state, or into monasteries.

26. Relates to almsgiving.

27. Relates to psalmody, as used for the cure of the soul, and as a satisfaction for sin.

28. Forbids to receive greater numbers into monasteries than can be maintained; relates to the dress of monks and nuns.

29. Forbids clerks, monks, and nuns, to dwell with lay persons.

30. Enjoins, amongst other things, that prayer be made by all monks and ecclesiastics for kings and dukes, and for the safety of all Christian people.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1565. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 94.

CLOVES-HOO. Held in 800, by Athelhard, arch- Cloves-hoo, 800.

[3] The *Lenten* Ember fast seems to be here omitted, as forming part of the great Lent fast.

bishop of Canterbury, in the presence of Kenulf, king of the Mercians. Laws were made for the preservation of Church property, and the faith of the Church declared to be substantially the same as that delivered by S. Augustin. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1153. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 162.

Cloves-hoo, 803. CLOVES-HOO. Held Oct. 12, 803, by Athelhard of Canterbury, with twelve bishops of his province, and four priest abbots. The object of this council was to settle the primacy finally at Canterbury, and to restore the dioceses which had been taken from that province by king Offa and pope Adrian, viz. Lichfield, Worcester, Leicester, Sidnachester[4], Hereford, Helman[5], and Thetford. All these sees had been united to make a province for the archbishop of Lichfield, who at this time was Adulf. Leo III. upon his attaining the popedom, favoured the request of king Kenulf and Athelhard, that the dismembered dioceses should be restored to the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was finally done in this council, which Adulf himself attended. It was decreed, "that the see archiepiscopal, from this time forward, should never be in the monastery of Lichfield, nor in any other place but the city of Canterbury, where Christ's Church is, and where the Catholic faith first shone forth in this island." The deed is signed by Athelhard and twelve bishops, each making beside his signature the sign of the cross.—*Johnson, Ecclesiastical Canon.* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1189. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 166.

Cloves-hoo, 822. CLOVES-HOO. Held in 822. Cænwulf, king of Mercia, having forcibly seized several of the Church lands in Kent, threatening the archbishop Wulfred with banishment in case of resistance, gave them to his daughter Wendritha, abbess of Whinchcombe in Gloucestershire. After the death of Cænwulf, Wulfred was enabled to obtain redress, and in this council the property of the Church was restored.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1527. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 172.

Cloves-hoo, 824. CLOVES-HOO. Held in 824. In this council the difference which had existed between Herbert of Worcester and the monks of Berkley, concerning the monastery of Westbury, was settled; the monastery being

[4] Probably Hatfield, in Lincolnshire.
[5] Probably Elmham, in Norfolk.

surrendered to the bishop. The decree, dated October 30, was signed by the king, twelve bishops, four abbots, the pope's deputy, and several lords.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1555. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 175.

COBLENTZ. [*Concilium Confluentinum.*] Held in 922, by order of the two kings, Charles the Simple, of France, and Henry of Germany. Eight bishops were present, Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, presiding, who drew up eight canons, of which no more than five have come down to us. The only one of any importance is the sixth, which directs that all monks shall submit in all things to the jurisdiction and control of the bishop of the diocese; also marriages between relations, as far as the sixth degree, are forbidden.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 579. Coblentz, 922.

COGNAC. [*Concilium Copriniacense.*] Held on the Monday after the octave of Easter, 1238, by Gerard de Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux, together with his suffragans. Thirty-eight canons, or articles of regulation, were published, amongst which we find some which show what great abuses had then crept into the monastic system. Cognac, 1238.

9. Orders that each bishop shall take care that sentences of excommunication pronounced by a brother bishop be enforced within his own diocese.

12 and 13. Forbid priests and monks to act as advocates in any cause, save that of their own churches or of the poor.

18. Fines those who continue forty days in a state of excommunication.

19. Directs that not only those persons who maltreat a clergyman shall be excluded from holding any ecclesiastical office or preferment, but their descendants also to the third generation.

20. Forbids abbots to give money to their monks in lieu of board, lodging, and clothing; also to take any entrance fee from new comers. Orders that, if the revenues of the house are too small for the maintenance of a large number of monks, the number shall be reduced.

22. Forbids monks to leave their walls without leave, and to eat abroad.

25. Orders that if either monk or canon shall be found to possess any property, he shall be deprived of church burial.

29. Forbids them to eat their meals with lay persons.

30. Forbids their living alone in priories, &c.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 556.

Cognac, 1255. COGNAC. Held in 1255, by the same archbishop, in which thirty-nine canons were published. The first seventeen are but a repetition of those of the council of Cognac, 1238.

19. Relates to fasting and abstinence.

20. Prohibits, under pain of excommunication, to eat flesh in Lent, especially on the first Sunday.

21. Contains a list of festivals to be observed throughout the year.

22. Declares that there are but ten prefaces.

23. Forbids the laity to enter the choir during service.

24. Directs that women about the time of their confinement shall confess and communicate.

26. Excommunicates those who attend fairs and markets on Sundays or festival days.

38. Forbids the married clergy to exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

39. Forbids to bury any corpse within the church, except that of the founder, the patron, or the chaplain. —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 746.

Cognac, 1260. COGNAC. Held in 1260, by Pierre de Roncevaux, archbishop of Bourdeaux. Nineteen statutes were made.

1. Forbids night-service or vigils either in the church or churchyard, on account of the disorders committed by the people who attended.

2. Forbids an ancient custom of dancing within the church on the day of the festival of the Holy Innocents, and choosing a mock bishop.

5. Forbids a priest to marry parties belonging to another parish without the licence of the chaplain or prior belonging to that parish.

7. Forbids, under anathema, cock-fighting, then much practised in schools.

15 and 16. Forbid extra-parochial burial without the curate's permission. One object of this canon was to prevent the ecclesiastical burial of excommunicated persons.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 799.

Cognac, 1262. COGNAC. Held in 1262, by the archbishop of Bourdeaux. Seven statutes were published.

1. Lays under an interdict those places in which ecclesiastical persons or property were forcibly detained.

5. Enjoins the clergy to say the office within churches with closed doors in places under interdict, and forbids any of the parishioners attending.

Another council was held by the same archbishop in the following year, the place is uncertain. Seven articles were agreed upon, of which the second declares that a person under sentence of excommunication for twelve months shall be looked upon as a heretic.—Tom. xi. p. 820—822.

COLOGNE. [*Concilium Coloniense.*] Held on the 1st of April, 887. In it the ancient canons were confirmed, and censures pronounced against those who pillaged the property of the Church, oppressed the poor, and married within the forbidden limits.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 396. Cologne, 887.

COLOGNE. Held on the 12th of March, 1260, by Conrad, archbishop of Cologne. In it were drawn up fourteen canons of discipline for the clergy, and eighteen for monks. Amongst the former: Cologne, 1260.

1. Is directed against those of the clergy who kept mistresses: forbids them to be present at the marriage of their children, and to leave them any thing by will.

3. Declares that all clergy should know how to read, and to chaunt the praises of God; and orders such as cannot do so to provide a deputy.

7. Orders that in churches belonging to canons, if there be no dormitory[6], one shall be forthwith built, and that the said canons shall occupy it, that they may be always ready to assist at matins; also forbids them to eat or sleep out of the confines of their church, i. e. the dormitory.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 784.

COLOGNE. Held in 1266, by Engilbert, archbishop of Cologne. Fifty-four canons were drawn up, which are chiefly against the plunderers of the Church, and those who killed, injured, and defrauded ecclesiastics. The last orders that the name of sacrilegious persons shall be kept in a book, and constantly read out—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 835. Cologne, 1266.

COLOGNE. Held in 1280, by Sifridus (Sifroi), archbishop of Cologne; eighteen canons were drawn up. Cologne, 1280.

1. Relates to the life and conversation of the clergy, and forbids them to play at games of chance; directs them to say daily the office of the Blessed Virgin.

[6] "*Dormitorium*," a gallery divided into several little cells, in which the monks live and sleep.

3. Relates to the state, &c., of the religious, and forbids monks or nuns to have any sort of property.

7. Treats at length of the sacrament of the altar, and directs that before celebrating the communion, the priests shall have said matins and prime, and have confessed, if they have the opportunity.

8. Treats of the sacrament of penance.

9. Of orders.

10. Of matrimony.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1107.

Cologne, 1300. COLOGNE. Held about the year 1300, by Wichbold, archbishop of Cologne; twenty-two canons were published. The second orders deans to deliver in writing a list of all non-resident incumbents in their deaneries. 15. Orders all priests in the diocese to excite their parishioners to contribute towards the fabric of the cathedral of Cologne. 17. Orders that the clerks appointed to ring the bells shall not be illiterate persons, who, if occasion require, may be able to assist the priest at the altar. (See next council.)—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1439.

Cologne, 1310. COLOGNE. Held on the 9th of March, 1310, by Henry, archbishop of Cologne, and three bishops. Twenty-nine canons were published.

11. Directs that the epistles and gospels shall be read only by persons in holy orders.

16. Directs that those persons, whose office it is to ring the church bells, shall know how to read, in order that they may be able to make the responses; and also that they shall wear the alb during divine service[7].

17. Directs that the rural deans shall provide that all their churches be furnished with proper ornaments.

21. Forbids to pronounce a curse against any person in the church, and to sing the "*Media Vita*" against any one, without the bishop's leave.

23. Directs that in future the year shall commence at the festival of Christmas, according to the use of the Roman Church.

[7] Bede, who lived in the early part of the eighth century, seems to be the first author who speaks of bells (campanæ). Probably they were first introduced in churches in the seventh century. Originally it was the priest's duty to sound the bells. Charlemagne, in his Capitulars, l. vi. c. 168, directs that the priests alone shall ring the bells for the canonical hours; and at least as late as the last century, it was the custom at Nôtre Dame, in Paris, for the bells to be rung by clergymen in surplices.

Others forbid parishioners to receive the holy communion, at Easter, at the hands of any but their own curates; order nuns to keep close to their cloisters, and monks to observe strictly the rule of poverty.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1517.

COLOGNE. Held in 1423, by Thierry, archbishop of Cologne. Eleven canons were made. Amongst other things, it was decreed, that clergymen convicted of incontinence should be deposed, if, after due warning, they did not amend their scandalous life; that priests alone shall be named to preach indulgences and to collect alms; that canons and other clerks refrain from talking during divine service, under penalty of losing allowance. Cologne, 1423.

The ninth canon is directed against the doctrines of Wickliff and John Huss.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 360.

COLOGNE. Held in 1452, by cardinal Cusa, legate *à latere* for Germany. Here it was decreed that a provincial council should be held at Cologne every three years, so that a synod should be held every year in one of the three dioceses; that all Jews, of both sexes, should have their dress marked with a circle, in order to distinguish them; that the clergy should keep their hair cut short; also, that processions with the holy sacrament should not be permitted to take place too frequently, and then that all should be done with extreme reverence.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1378. Cologne, 1452.

COLOGNE. Held in 1536, by Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, assisted by his suffragans, and several others. The acts of this council are divided into fourteen articles, each article containing several decrees relating to the discipline of the Church. Cologne, 1536.

Art. 1. Consists of thirty-six canons, and treats of the duties of bishops, especially in ordaining and visiting. Amongst other things:—4. Buying and selling of benefices, and worldly motives in giving them, are denounced as detestable; also, 32. Pluralities are condemned, and those who have the pope's licence for a plurality of benefices are bidden to inquire of their consciences whether they have God's licence also.

Art. 2. Relates to the offices of the Church, &c., and contains thirty-two canons. Bishops are exhorted to reform their Breviaries where they are defective, and to purge out all false or doubtful legends, which have been inserted, (*nescimus qua incuria,*) instead of pas-

Cologne, 1536.

sages from Holy Scripture; directions are given that the Breviary be recited with reverence and attention, and that the mass be celebrated with proper devotion. Canon 15. Defines the proper use of organs, which, it states, are intended to excite devotion, and not profane emotions of joy. With regard to the morals and conduct of the clergy, it states, (canon 22) that pride, luxury, and avarice, are the principal causes of their evil reputation; and, (in canons 23, 24, 25,) that they ought to abstain from great feasts and good living, and from drunkenness and other like vices.

Arts. 3, 4, and 5, relate to cathedral and other churches, and those who serve them, to the mendicant friars, &c., and contain in all fifty-seven canons. Canons are ordered to live canonically, as their name imports, to remember the original intention of their institution, which was, that they should dwell together, &c.; if they fail on any occasion to be present at mass after the epistle, or at the hours after the first Psalm, they shall be deprived of their allowance. Non-residence is forbidden. Persons having cure of souls are exhorted to be careful to exhibit a pattern to their flocks.

Art. 6. Relates to the preaching of the word of God, and contains twenty-seven canons; states that the preacher ought constantly to read in and meditate upon the Holy Scriptures; to accommodate his discourse to the understanding of his hearers; to avoid profane eloquence and worldly declamation, and everything tending to the ridiculous; shews how the clergy are to instruct the people upon controverted subjects, and to repress vice. Canon 26 directs that the decalogue and creed shall be plainly recited immediately after the sermon.

Art. 7. Relates to the sacraments of the Church, and contains fifty-two canons. It reckons seven sacraments; directs that the clergy should instruct the people that the visible part of a sacrament is but the sensible sign of the effect produced upon the soul; it treats of each of the seven sacraments in detail. Amongst other things, it declares, that, in order to be admitted to the communion, it is necessary to have a pure conscience, a heart truly penitent, and a lively faith, to realize the truth of Christ's body offered and his blood poured forth in that sacrament. With regard to the communion in both kinds, canon 15 directs the

priest to teach those of his parishioners who are hurt at the denial of the cup, that the layman who receives the bread only, receives as fully and completely both the body and the blood of our Lord, as the priest does who receives in both kinds; that the Church, out of reverence to the sacrament, and for the salvation of the faithful, hath thought proper so to order it, and that, consequently, the laity, being assured that they do receive both the body and blood of Christ, should submit to its judgment.

Art. 8. Containing seven canons, is upon the subject of the maintenance of the clergy; it forbids any fee for the administration of the sacraments or for burials; it also enjoins the restoration of tithes by those laymen who had usurped them.

Art. 9. Containing twenty-one canons, speaks of the usages and customs of the Church; directs that fasting, being an ordinance of the Church, may not be neglected, and declares that to eat delicious first-meals on days appointed to be observed with fasting, is not to obey the spirit of the Church's injunction; it also explains the appointment of Rogation days, and declares that Sunday is to be observed and kept holy; that on that day, it is the duty of the faithful to hear mass and the sermon, and to sing the psalms and hymns; forbids fairs to be held on that day, and the frequenting of taverns.

Art. 10. Contains nineteen canons, and relates to monastic discipline.

Art. 11. Contains eight canons, relating to almshouses, hospitals, and similar establishments; states that it is the bishop's duty to look after the repair of those which have fallen into decay, and to provide for the spiritual care of those persons who dwell in them.

Art. 12. Contains nine canons, relating to schools, libraries, &c.

Art. 13. Relates to contests about ecclesiastical jurisdiction, &c., and contains four canons.

Art. 14. Relates to episcopal and other visitations, and contains twenty-four canons.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 484.

COLOGNE. Held in 1549, by Adolphus, archbishop. Several statutes were made for the reformation of the Church; the six principal methods recommended are the following. Cologne, 1549.

1. The restoration of learning.
2. The examination of candidates for holy orders.
3. Care and diligence on the part of the clergy in the performance of their sacred function.
4. Episcopal and archidiaconal visitations.
5. The frequent convocation of synods.
6. The removal of the principal abuses.

1. As to the first, it was ordered that the education of the young should be confided to those persons only, whose purity of faith and life was known, and who had undergone an examination by the ordinary, or by persons approved by him. That no suspected nor contagious works should be allowed in colleges or universities.

2. It is declared that the examination of candidates for orders, and of persons to be instituted to benefices, belongs to the bishop alone, or to persons authorized by him; and that those who desire to be ordained shall give public notice of the same.

3. The clergy are ordered to inflict the penalty enjoined by the canons upon those whose sins have deserved it, and not to remit it for money. Pluralities are forbidden.

4. The end of episcopal visitations is declared to be the correction of vice, and the restoration of purity of life and discipline. Bishops are exhorted to take but few followers with them in their visitations, to avoid burdening their clergy.

5. The necessity of holding ecclesiastical synods is shown, in order to preserve the faith and discipline of the Church in their integrity, and to maintain purity of morals, to ensure the reformation of abuses.

6. Treats of the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline.

These statutes were approved by the emperor's letters patent.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 627.

Compiegne, 756. COMPIEGNE. [*Concilium Compendiense.*] Held in 756. At this council, Pepin, king of France, several bishops and lords, together with the legates of pope Stephen, were present. An organ sent by the Eastern emperor to Pepin was received. Eighteen canons were published, chiefly relating to questions about marriages.

1. Orders the separation of parties marrying within the third degree.

3. Declares that a wife taking the veil without her

husband's consent, must be given up to him, if he requires it.

5. Allows a free man who marries a slave under the idea that she was free, to put her away and to marry again; also allows the same to a free woman.

9. Declares baptism administered by an unbaptized priest, in the name of the Blessed Trinity, valid. —Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1694.

COMPIEGNE. Held on the 5th August, 1235, concerning certain articles which, according to the archbishop of Rheims, violated the liberties of the Church. The archbishop and six of his suffragans proceeded to S. Denys, in order to make a second monition to the king, which step induced the lords to prefer a complaint by letter to the pope against the bishops and clergy; this letter is dated September, 1235. The king (S. Louis), by an ordinance, declared that his own vassals and those of the lords, were not bound, in civil matters, to answer any charge in the ecclesiastical courts; and that if the ecclesiastical judge should proceed to excommunicate any one in such a case, he should be compelled to remove the excommunication by the seizure of his temporalities. The pope exhorted S. Louis to revoke this ordinance, declaring, amongst other things, that God had confided to the pope both the temporal and spiritual government of the world. However, the letter seems to have had little effect upon S. Louis, who refused to revoke the edict.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 503. Compiegne, 1235.

COMPIEGNE. Held in 1277, by Peter, archbishop of Rheims, with eight of his suffragans. They made a decree relating to the insubordinate conduct of the chapters of the cathedral churches of the province, who pretended, amongst other things, to a right to put a stop to divine service, and to lay the city under an interdict, for the sake of protecting their own immunities. —Tom. x. Conc. p. 1031. Compiegne, 1277.

COMPIEGNE. Held on the 4th January, 1304, by Robert de Courtenay, archbishop of Rheims, assisted by eight bishops, and the deputies of three absent. They made five decrees. Compiegne, 1304.

2. Forbids the levying imposts upon the clergy under false pretences.

5. Restricts the dinner of the clergy of the province to two dishes, over and above the pottage or soup, ex-

cept they have any great person at the table.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1492.

Compostella, 900. COMPOSTELLA. Held May 6, 900, upon occasion of the dedication of the church of St. James. Seventeen bishops were present, together with king Alfonso, his family, and many others.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 482.

Compostella, 1056. COMPOSTELLA. Held in 1056, by Cresconius, archdeacon of Compostella. Amongst other things, it was decreed that all bishops and priests should say mass daily, and that the clergy should wear hair shirts on days of fasting and penitence.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1087.

Constance, 1414 to 1418. Falsely styled Œcumenical. CONSTANCE. [*Concilium Constantiense.*] This council was assembled by pope John XXIII., in accordance with the writ of the emperor Sigismund. One of its chief objects was to put an end to the schism which had afflicted the Church for thirty years, and which was caused by the several claimants of the papacy. At this time, besides John (Balthasar Cossa), two others claimed the title of pope, viz. Pedro of Luna, a native of Catalonia, who styled himself Benedict XIII., and Angelo Corrario, a Venetian, who assumed the name of Gregory XII.

Another object of the council was to take cognizance of the heresies of Huss and Wickliff. The council was convoked to meet at Constance on the festival of All Saints, A. D. 1414, and so great was the influx of persons, that it was reckoned that not less than thirty thousand horses were brought to Constance[7], which may give us some idea of the enormous concourse of people.

I. Session. Nov. 16. The council was opened on the 5th, with solemn prayer, and the first session held on the 16th November, in which John the pope presided, and delivered an address, in which he exhorted all present to give themselves entirely to the business of the council. After which the bull of convocation was read, and the officers of the council were appointed, viz.

Ten notaries.

One guardian of the council.

[7] One archbishop alone brought with him six hundred horses. It was therefore no wonder that provender for cattle became extremely scarce; indeed, a regulation was subsequently made, restricting John himself to twenty horses; the cardinals, to ten each; the bishops, to five; and abbots, to four.

The auditors of the rota [8].
Four advocates.
Two promoters.
Four officers to superintend all matters relating to arrangement and ceremony.

Lastly, the canon of the eleventh council of Toledo, held in 675, was read, which relates to the gravity and decorum to be observed in such assemblies.

In the interval between the first and second session, John Huss [9], who, upon the strength of the emperor's safe-conduct had ventured to Constance, was treacherously seized and thrown into prison by order of John XXIII., and his trial commenced. His accusers, who are said to have been also his personal enemies, drew up a catalogue of his imputed errors, which they presented to the pope and to the council. Amongst other things, they charged him with having taught publicly that the laity had a right to the communion in both kinds; that in the holy sacrament of the altar the substance of the bread remains unchanged after consecration; that priests living in mortal sin cannot administer the sacraments; that, on the contrary, any other person, being in a state of grace, can do so; that by "the Church," is not to be understood either the pope or the clergy; that the church cannot possess any temporalities, and that the laity have a right to deprive her of them.

In this interval, moreover, vast numbers of temporal and spiritual dignitaries arrived; amongst others, the well-known Peter Daillé, cardinal of Cambray; also the emperor Sigismund, who, on Christmas day, assisted at mass in the habit of a deacon, and chanted the

[8] "*Rota*," one of the chief tribunals of Rome, composed of twelve prelates called "auditors of the rota," eight of whom are Italians, two Spaniards, one French, and one German, the senior acting as president. The sovereigns of their respective nations nominate the last four. They take cognizance of all appeals relating to ecclesiastical suits, and to matters relating to benefices, &c. From them an appeal lies to the pope in person. The origin of the name seems not to be very clear. Their judgments are called "decisions."

[9] According to Mansi, he arrived before the first session, on the 3rd of November. He also states, that the real cause of his seizure and imprisonment was this, that although he had been admonished not to preach or teach the Wickliffite doctrines of which he was accused during his residence at Constance, he nevertheless persisted in doing so. His imprisonment began on the 28th of November.

Constance, 1414 to 1418.

gospel. In the month of February the deputies of Gregory and Benedict arrived, and now several congregations were held, and steps taken to persuade John to abdicate, on account of his notoriously immoral conduct. It was resolved to take the opinion of the various nations composing the council, and for that purpose it was divided into four classes, according to their nations, viz.—1, Italy; 2, France; 3, Germany; 4, England [1]. From each class a certain number of deputies were elected, having at their head a president, who was changed every month. The deputies of each nation then met separately to deliberate upon such measures as they considered best to propose to the council, and when any one class of deputies had agreed upon a measure, it was carried to the general assembly of the four nations; and if the measure, upon consideration, was approved, it was signed and sealed, to be presented at the next session, in order to receive the sanction of the whole council.

In one of these congregations a list of heavy accusations against pope John XXIII. was presented, and, in consequence, deputies were sent to him to engage him to resign the pontificate. He, in answer, promised to do so, if his two competitors would, on their part, engage to do the same. Nevertheless, he put off from day to day making any clear and formal act of cession; and during that time the deputies of the university of Paris arrived with Gerson their chancellor.

II. Session. March 22, 1415.

In the second session John made a formal declaration, accompanied with an oath, to the effect that he would abdicate, if by that means the schism could be healed. But when, in a subsequent congregation, they proceeded to deliberate about a new election to the pontificate, John, disguised in a postillion's dress, secretly escaped from the city to the castle of Schaffhausen. The council proceeded, nevertheless, to labour to effect the union of the Church, and Gerson made a long discourse tending to establish the superiority of the council over the pope.

This discourse was the origin of the question, which was then very warmly agitated, viz. whether the authority of an œcumenical council is greater than that of

[1] Baronius says into five nations, the Spaniards forming the fifth.

a pope or not? Gerson proves that in certain cases the Church, or, which is the same thing, an œcumenical council, can assemble without the command or consent of the pope, even supposing him to have been canonically elected, and to live respectably. These peculiar cases he states to be— Constance, 1414 to 1418.

1. If the pope, being accused, and brought into a position requiring the opinion of the Church, refuse to convoke a council for the purpose.

2. When important matters concerning the government of the Church are in agitation, requiring to be set at rest by an œcumenical council, which, nevertheless, the pope refuses to convoke.

In the third session, the cardinal of Florence read a declaration made in the name of the council, by which it is declared, first, that the council is lawfully assembled; secondly, that the flight of the pope cannot dissolve it, and that it shall not separate, nor be transferred to another place, until the union of the Church shall have been effected, and the Church reformed as to faith and morals; thirdly, that John XXIII. shall not withdraw his officers from Constance without the approval and consent of the council, nor shall the prelates leave the council without just cause. III. Session. March 25.

The emperor Sigismund was himself present in the fourth session, in which the cardinal of Florence read the five articles upon which the fathers of the council had agreed. The most worthy of note is the decree, which declares that the aforesaid council of Constance having been lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and forming an œcumenical council of the whole Church militant, hath received its authority immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ; a power which every person whatsoever, of whatever state or dignity he may be, even the pope himself, must obey in all matters relating to the faith, the extirpation of schism, and the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members. It was also decreed that the pope should not transfer the council to any other place, and declared null and void all processes and censures directed by the pope against those attending the council. IV. Session, March 30.

In the fifth session the articles which had been read in the last, were a second time read, and unanimously approved. The departure of John was declared to be unlawful, and that he would justly subject himself to V. Session, April 6.

Constance, 1414 to 1418.

corporal punishment and imprisonment should he refuse to return. The emperor was charged to arrest all persons endeavouring to quit Constance in disguise. Also the decree of the council of Rome against the writings of Wickliff was confirmed [2].

VI. Session. April 16.

The emperor was present in the sixth session, in which pope John XXIII. was summoned to present himself at the council, or to issue a bull, declaring that he had vacated the pontificate. A citation was also issued against Jerome of Prague. It is, however, easy to see by his answer to the deputies, that his design was only to amuse the council, and thenceforward the fathers resolved to proceed against him as against a notorious heretic and schismatic.

Letters from the university of Paris to their deputies in the council, and others to the emperor, were read, in which they exhort both of the parties to proceed firmly with the matter of the union, notwithstanding the pope's absence.

In the interval between the sixth and seventh sessions disputes arose amongst the theologians as to the *form* in which the decree condemning the doctrines of Wickliff should be drawn up. Some wishing that this condemnation should be made in the name of the pope with consent of the council, whilst others insisted upon the omission of the pope's name altogether. Daillé was of the latter opinion, and he composed a treatise in support of his views: he maintained that the position of his adversaries was heretical, viz. that the council had no authority in itself, except through the pope its head; for in that case, he urged, the council of Pisa would have possessed no authority, not having been assembled by any pope; and if so, that then the election of John himself would be invalid, since he succeeded Alexander V., who had been elected by the council of Pisa.

In the second place, he maintained that this very council of Pisa was superior to the pope, from the fact, that already two popes had been deposed by it; and that any other œcumenical council would possess the same power.—*Gerson, Op.* Tom. ii. p. 950.

VII. Session. May 2.

In the seventh session John was cited to appear

[2] The decrees of the fourth and fifth sessions were entirely approved and received by the clergy of France, in an assembly held in 1682.

in person with his adherents within nine days, in order to justify himself with respect to the charges of heresy, schism, simony, and various other enormous crimes brought against him; in case of refusal, they declared that they would proceed against him. It may be observed that John, after many removals, had at this time settled at Brisac. Constance, 1414 to 1418.

In this session the affair of Jerome of Prague was again discussed.

In the eighth session the condemnation of Wickliff's errors was proceeded with. The errors imputed to him were contained in forty-five articles or propositions. He is said in the first three to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation and a real corporal presence. In 4, to assert that a bishop or priest, in mortal sin, cannot perform the proper functions of his office. In 6, that God is obliged to obey the devil. 8, That a bad pope has no power over the Church. In 13, that they who hinder preaching will be held excommunicated by Christ in the last day. 16, That the temporal powers may, at will, take away the property of the Church. 18, That tithes are merely charitable offerings, which may be denied to the bad ministers. 27, That all things happen by an absolute necessity. 28, That confirmation, ordination, and consecration of places have been reserved to the pope and to bishops solely for the sake of gain. 29, That universities, schools, &c. are mere vanities, which help the devil as much as they do the Church. 34, That all of the order of mendicants are heretics. 35, That no one entering into any order of religion can keep the Divine precept, and therefore cannot attain to the kingdom of heaven. 37, That the Church of Rome is the synagogue of Satan. 38, That the decretals are apocryphal, and the clergy who study them fools. 39, That the emperor and secular princes who endowed the Church were seduced by the devil. 41, That it is not necessary to salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme amongst all other churches. 42, That it is folly to put faith in the indulgences of popes and bishops. 44, That Augustine, Benedict, and Bernard are damned, unless they repented of having had property, and of having entered the religious state. 45, That all religions indifferently have been introduced by the devil. All of these forty-five articles, together with all the books written by him, were condemned, and his bones VIII. Sess. May 4.

Constance, 1414 to 1418.

ordered to be dug up, and cast out of consecrated ground.

In the interval between sessions eight and nine, John XXIII. was arrested at Fribourg.

IX. Session, May 13.

In this session a proposition was received from the pope, offering to send three cardinals to the council to answer the charges brought against him; but the council rejected the offer. Two cardinals and five prelates were nominated to summon the pope thrice at the door of the church, and as he did not appear, an act declaring this citation was drawn up.

After this session the depositions of witnesses against John were taken; amongst the ten who came forward were bishops, abbots, and doctors.

X. Session, May 14.

On the following day, in the tenth session, the commissioners made their report of the depositions against the pope. After which, having been again cited thrice without appearing, the council proceeded to declare John XXIII. convicted of the charges brought against him; viz. of having brought scandal upon the Church by his corrupt life, and of having publicly been guilty of simony, and as such, suspended from the exercise of any of the functions of the papal office, and from every administration temporal or spiritual, with a prohibition, at the same time, to every Christian, of whatever rank or condition, to obey him thenceforth directly or indirectly, under penalty of being punished as an abettor of schism. The accusations were contained under seventy heads, all well proved; but fifty only were read in the council (in the following session), relating chiefly to his simony, his worldly life, his vexatious conduct, his false oaths, &c.; other things which decency required to be passed over in silence were suppressed. Sentence of suspension having been thus pronounced, messengers were sent to him to notify to him what the council had decreed. He did not in any way deny the justice of his sentence, and recognized the council as holy and infallible, and at the same time delivered up the seal, ring[3], and book of supplications, which they demanded of him, begging the council to take measures for his subsistence and honour.

[3] The ring—called for nearly five hundred years "the fisherman's ring"—with which the apostolical briefs are sealed; it bears the image of S. Peter, and is said to owe its name to the tradition which declares that the apostle first made use of it.

In the eleventh session, the various heads of the accusation against John XXIII. were read. Jerome of Prague, who had endeavoured to escape, was arrested, and thrown into prison. Constance. XI. Session, May 25.

In the following session, the sentence of deposition against John XXIII. having been read, and unanimously approved, was definitively passed; at the same time, all the three competitors for the papacy were declared incapable of being elected again. XII. Sess. May 29.

In the thirteenth session, a decree was made, in reply to a petition presented by the Hussites, upon the subject of the communion in both kinds, to this effect, that although Jesus Christ instituted the holy sacrament of the eucharist after supper, under the two kinds of bread and wine, nevertheless, the use sanctioned by the Church is not to celebrate that sacrament after supper, nor even to permit the faithful to receive it otherwise than fasting, except in cases of sickness or other necessity; and that, secondly, although in the primitive Church this sacrament was received by the faithful in both kinds, yet, in after-ages, the laity had been permitted to receive in one kind only, viz. the bread, and for this reason, because it ought to be most surely believed that the whole body and the whole blood of Jesus Christ is truly contained under the species of bread; that, therefore, the custom introduced by the Church must be regarded as a law, which may not be rejected or altered at the will of individuals, without the sanction of the Church; and that to maintain that this custom is sacrilegious or unlawful is an error, such that the obstinate perseverance in it deserves to be punished as heresy, and even with the secular arm, if necessary. XIII. Sess. June 15.

In this session [4], several decrees were read: the first of which forbad to proceed to the election of a new pope, without the consent of the council; also the abdication of Gregory XII. was received, being made in his name by Charles de Malatesta and cardinal Dominic. Pedro of Luna was called upon to do the same; but he steadily refused to the day of his death, which happened in 1424. XIV. Sess. July 4.

In the fifteenth session, the trial of Huss, who was brought before the council, was terminated. XV. Sess. July 6.

[4] [In the preceding, *Baronius.*] Also the three rival popes were by name excluded from the possibility of being again elected.

Constance, 1414 to 1418.

The promoters of the council demanded that the articles preached and taught by John Huss, in Bohemia and elsewhere, being heretical, seditious, deceitful, and offensive to pious ears, should be condemned by the council, and that the books from which they were extracted should be burned. Huss not being willing to retract[5], was condemned to be degraded and given over to the secular arm, and in the end was cruelly burned alive, on the 6th of July, 1415. In the same session, the opinion of John Petit, a D.D. of Paris, was condemned as heretical, scandalous, and seditious; he maintained that any individual had a right to take away the life of a tyrant, and that the deed was even meritorious; no sentence, however, was passed upon the author of this opinion, who was protected by the duke of Burgundy and other powerful friends.

Sessions XVI. and XVII. July 11, 15.

In the two following sessions, preparations were made for the departure of king Sigismund, who proposed to go in person to the king of Arragon, to induce him to renounce the cause of Pedro of Luna.

XVIII. Sess. August 17.

In the eighteenth session, various decrees were made, one declaring the same credit and obedience to be due towards the bulls of the council, as to those of the holy see.

XIX. Sess. Sept. 23.

In the next session, Jerome of Prague, terrified by the horrible end of Huss, was induced to make a recantation of the errors imputed to him. A declaration was also made, in which it was stated that, notwithstanding the safe conduct of kings, inquisition might always be made into the conduct of heretics.

[5] His refusal, which he read from a written paper, was couched in these terms: "I, John Huss, in hope, a priest of Jesus Christ, fearing to offend God, and fearing to fall into perjury, refuse to abjure all or any of those articles which have been produced against me by false witnesses; because God is my witness, that I have not preached, asserted, or defended them, as they have said that I defended, asserted, and preached them. Also, of the articles extracted from my books, at least those which have been fairly extracted, I say that whichsoever of them contains any false sense, that I detest. But fearing to offend against God, and to speak against the opinion of the saints, I am not willing to abjure any of them. And if it were possible that my voice could be extended to the whole world, (as every lie and my every sin will be laid open in the day of judgment,) I would most willingly, before the whole world, revoke every falsehood and every error that I ever conceived or spoke. I say and write this freely and voluntarily. Written with my own hand, this 1st day of July."

In the twentieth session, the differences between the bishop of Trent and duke Frederick of Austria were discussed. The twelve chapters of Narbonne, agreed upon between king Sigismund, and the deputies of the council, and the deputies of Benedict, were approved. Constance, XX. Sess. Nov. 21.

After the session, an assembly was held to consider concerning the reformation of the Church, and the repression of simony.

Also, in the interval between the twentieth and twenty-first sessions, several congregations were held, in one, the affair of John Petit was further discussed; in another, Jerome of Prague, whose retractation was suspected, being brought forward, boldly declared that he had not sincerely retracted, spoke of Huss as a saint, and proclaimed his entire adherence to his doctrine, and to that of Wickliffe.

In the next session, Jerome was again brought before the council, and revoking his forced retractation, spoke boldly in favour of his original opinions; sentence was then passed upon him, he was declared to be a relapsed heretic, was excommunicated and anathematized, and lastly, was handed over to the secular arm, and burned. XXI. Sess. 30 May, 1416.

Measures were taken in this session to unite the Arragonese to the council, they having hitherto acknowledged Benedict XIII. XXII. Sess. Oct. 15.

In the twenty-third session, the proceedings against Benedict XIII. (Pedro of Luna) commenced, and he was definitively condemned in the thirty-seventh, when he was deposed, and declared to be a perjurer, and to have brought scandal upon the whole Church, &c.; and, as such, the council degraded and deposed him, deprived him of all his dignities and offices, forbidding him thenceforward to consider himself as pope, and all Christian people to obey him, under pain of being dealt with as abettors of schism and heresy. Sessions XXIII. to XXXVII. From Nov. 5, 1416, to July 26, 1417.

In the thirty-eighth session, the decree of the council, annulling all sentences and censures uttered by Benedict XIII. against the ambassadors or allies of the king of Castile, was read. XXXVIII. Sess. July 28.

In the thirty-ninth session, the question of Church reform was entered upon, and several decrees made, one of which declares the necessity of frequently holding councils, in order to check the progress of heresy and schism, and directs that another œcumenical council shall be held five years after the dissolution of the XXXIX. Sess. Oct. 9.

Constance, 1414 to 1418.

present; a third, seven years after the second; and after that, one every ten years, in a place appointed by the pope at the close of each council, with the approbation and consent of the council; in case of war or pestilence, the pope, with the concurrence of the cardinals, to have power to appoint any other place, and to hasten, but not to retard, the time for assembling. Another decree provides for cases of schism, and orders that, when there shall be two claimants of the papal chair, a council shall be held in the very next year, and that both claimants shall suspend every administration until the council shall have commenced its sittings. The third decree relates to the profession of faith, which the newly elected pope was to make in the presence of his electors; in it eight œcumenical councils are recognized [6], besides the general councils of Lateran, Lyons, and Vienne. A fourth decree is directed against the translation of bishops.

XL. Sess. Oct. 30.

In the fortieth session, a decree, containing eighteen well-matured articles of reformation, was proposed. It was there provided, that the new pope, whom they were about speedily to elect, should labour to reform the Church, in its head and in its members, as well as the court of Rome, in concert with the council, or the national deputies. Its principal articles relate to the annates, the reserves of the apostolic see, the collations to benefices, and the expectatives; what causes may or may not be carried to Rome; in what cases it is lawful to depose a pope, and how it can be done; to the extirpation of simony; to dispensations; to indulgences, and to tithes.

The article upon the annates or first-fruits was very warmly discussed by the cardinals and national deputies, but the latter finally declared that it was necessary to suppress them altogether, and chiefly for this reason, that whereas they had been originally but a voluntary offering to the Roman see, they had subsequently been made, under pretext of custom, an obligatory payment. In fact, we find no mention of annates before the time of Clement V., who for three years imposed them upon England, but was opposed by the parliament. Boniface IX. was the first who pretended to claim them as a right attached to the dignity of sovereign pontiff. Moreover,

[6] Namely, two of Nicea, four of Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon.

the taxing of benefices was pronounced a simoniacal exaction. Constance.

In the forty-first session it was decreed, that for this time alone, six prelates of different nations, should be chosen within the space of ten days, in order to proceed to the election of the pope with the college of cardinals. Accordingly the electors held a conclave, and on the 11th of November after, cardinal Colonna was elected pope, and took the style of Martin V. After his coronation the national deputies having required of him that he would labour to effect a reformation of the Church, he renewed his promise to do so. XLI. Sess. Nov. 8.

In the forty-second session the new pope presided, and the emperor was present. A bull was read, releasing the emperor from the custody of Balthasar, and ordering him to be delivered over to the pope. The national deputies presented a memorial on the subject of reform to the pope. Martin, troubled by their importunity, gave in a scheme of reformation, based upon the eighteen articles proposed in session forty. XLII. Sess. Dec. 28.

Between this and the forty-third session the pope issued a bull confirming the acts, &c. of the council of Constance. In the edition of Haguenau, A. D. 1500, this bull is regarded as the act of the council itself, whereas in other editions it appears to be the pope who approves and confirms the council. However this may be, the first article of this bull is worthy of remark, for in it Martin desires that any one suspected in the faith shall swear that he receives all the œcumenical councils, and especially that of Constance, which proves that the pope considered this council lawful and œcumenical, and as he desired that all the acts of this council should be received by all persons, he thereby approves that passed in the fifth session, which declares the superiority of the council to the pope.

In the forty-third session decrees were published restraining the abuse of exemptions and dispensations, and condemning simony. The canons relating to modesty of dress in ecclesiastics were renewed, but no other objects of reform were proposed besides those contained in the decree of the fortieth session, and of them six only were drawn up in this forty-third session. The reformation of the college of cardinals and of the court of Rome, which had been decreed by the council, was passed over without notice. XLIII. Sess. March 21, 1418.

XLIV. Sess. April 19. The pope, in order to satisfy the decree made in the thirty-ninth session, appointed Pavia for the meeting of the next council.

XLV. Sess. April 22. On the 22nd of April, 1418, the last session was held. After the celebration of high mass, the pope read a discourse to the council, which being ended, one of the cardinals, by order of the pope and council, dismissed the assembly with the words, "Go in peace." This council lasted three years and a half.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 1—294. *Herman Vander Hart, Acta Concil. Const.* 6 vols. in fol. 1698. *Bourgeois de Chastenet, Hist. du Conc. du Constance.* Paris, 1718.

Constantinople, 362 or 360. CONSTANTINOPLE. [*Concilium Constantinopolitanum.*] Held in 362 (or 360), in which sixty-two bishops excommunicated and deposed Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, for his errors in faith concerning the Holy Spirit.—*Mosheim, Ecc. Hist.* cent. iv. part ii. chap. v.

Constantinople, 381. Second Œcumenical Council. CONSTANTINOPLE. The second œcumenical council was held at Constantinople, A. D. 381, convoked by order of the emperor Theodosius.

The principal objects for which this council was convoked were the following:

To confirm the faith as delivered at Nicea.

To appoint a bishop to the church of Constantinople.

To take measures for the union of the Church.

To make regulations for the good of the church.

Bishops attended from all parts of the East except Egypt. The number of those present, as commonly received, was one hundred and fifty, but the signatures amount to one hundred and forty-two only. Amongst the more celebrated of the bishops were Meletius of Antioch, S. Gregory of Nyssa, Peter of Sebaste, Amphilochius of Iconium, Pelagius of Laodicea, Eulogius of Edessa, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, Helladius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Diodorus of Thrace, and Acacius of Berea. "Never were there," says Tillemont, "in any council of the Church, so large a number of saints and confessors." It does not appear that any letter or deputies were sent on the part of Damasus, the pope, or of any other bishop in the West. Theodosius assembled this council from the Eastern Church only, because the error which they were to consider had only affected the Eastern branch. S. Meletius at first presided, although his ill health obliged him frequently to absent himself.

Constantinople, 381.

The first question considered was that relating to the Church of Constantinople, and it was declared that Maximus, called the Cynic, had not been lawfully made bishop; that his ordination, and all that he had since done in his pretended character of bishop, was null and void, and that in fine he was a usurper of the see of Constantinople. Then they proceeded to elect to the see S. Gregory Nazianzen, and eventually, notwithstanding his entreaties and tears, obliged him to accept the office. During these proceedings it pleased God to take away S. Meletius unto Himself, and S. Gregory of Nazianzen succeeded him as president of the council. He endeavoured with all his powers to induce them to leave Paulinus in the see of Antioch, with the view of appeasing the divisions of that Church; but his efforts were ineffectual. The bishops of Macedonia and of Egypt (who had now arrived) vehemently opposed his designs, objecting also to his election, upon the ground that, being already bishop of another see, he ought not to have been translated to that of Constantinople. In consequence of this, S. Gregory formed the resolution to entreat the fathers to permit him to resign the see of Constantinople, which he in the end did, and Nectarius was elected in his room. During this interval Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, presided over the council; but Nectarius, immediately after his election, took that office upon himself. Now Nectarius had been a priest in the latter city, but so far from having passed through the inferior degrees, as the canons direct, he had not been even baptized.

The exact time at which the following acts were passed in the council is unknown. After labouring in vain to unite the Macedonians to the Church, by proposing to them to receive the faith as settled by the council of Nicea, they were pronounced to be heretics, and the council afterwards proceeded to publish seven canons.

1. Confirms the faith of the council of Nicea, and anathematizes ("extrema execratione ac detestatione,") all who deny it, especially the Arians, Eunomians, Eudoxians, Sabellians, Apollinarians, and others.

2. Forbids bishops to go beyond their borders, and to trouble other dioceses. Orders that the bishop of Alexandria shall have the sole administration of Egypt, and that the privileges given to the Church of Antioch

Constantinople. 381.

by the Nicene canons shall be preserved. Orders that the affairs of the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian dioceses shall be severally administered by their respective bishops, and that the synod of each province shall administer the affairs of the province, according to the canon of Nicea.

3. By this canon the primacy of honour is given to the bishop of Constantinople after the bishop of Rome, on account, as it states, of its being "the new Rome[7]."

4. Declares the nullity of the consecration and of the episcopal acts of Maximus.

5[8]. As regards the books of the Western Church, we have also received those in Antioch, who confess one and the same Divinity in the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity.

6. Lays down a rule for ecclesiastical judgments, and permits all persons whatever to bring an accusation against a bishop or any other ecclesiastic on account of any private injury or wrong said to have been received; but in Church matters it directs that no accusation shall be received coming from heretics or schismatics, or from persons excommunicated or deposed, or accused of any crime, before they shall have justified themselves.

7. Gives direction as to the manner in which heretics ought to be received into the Church; Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Quartodecimani[9], and

[7] ". . . Constantinopolitanus tamen Episcopus obtineto præcipuum honorem et dignitatem secundum Episcopum Romanorum, ideo quod Constantinopolis Nova Roma est." According to Dupin, the popes rejected the canons of this council on account of the foregoing passage. Yet see the Lateran council, A.D. 1215, chap. v.

[8] Great doubt exists whether this and the two following canons were made in this council; they are omitted in two of the versions. It is also extremely doubtful what is meant by the "Book of the Western Church." According to Beveridge this book was the letter of the western bishops inviting the Orientals to the council of Rome, in 382, to which an answer was returned in the following council of Constantinople. But it is more probable that the epistle of pope Damasus, circulated throughout the East, and received by the council of Antioch in 380, is intended. (See C. Antioch, A.D. 380.) Some suppose it to mean the Nicene definition of faith, as confirmed at Sardica.—*Hammond's Canons of the Church.*

[9] In the original Greek, τεσσερεσκαιδεκατίται, i. e. those who kept the festival of Easter on the 14th day of the Paschal moon, and not on the Lord's day.

Apollinarians, were simply to be required to renounce their errors in writing, to anathematize all heresies, and to be anointed with the holy chrism on the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Others, such as the Eunomians (who baptized with one immersion), Montanists, Sabellians, &c., were to be received as heathens, i. e. to be catechised, exorcised, and baptized. Constantinople, 381.

As to the faith, the council (in canon 1) condemned the Arians, semi-Arians, and Eunomians, who denied the proper Divinity of the Word; the Macedonians, who refused to recognize that of the Holy Spirit; and the Apollinarians, who denied the truth of the Incarnation.

The consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son, was set forth, the acts of the council of Nicea were confirmed, and all the recent heresies anathematized; further, the creed of the Church, as laid down at Nicea, was extended to meet the heresies of the Apollinarians and Macedonians. Thus for the words "He was incarnate," as contained in the Nicene creed, were substituted "He was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary." The original creed of Nicea said simply, "He suffered, and the third day He rose again, ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead."

The Constantinopolitan creed says, "He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, He suffered, and was buried; and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end."

The Nicene creed also makes mention only of the Holy Spirit, omitting the Church. The creed, as settled at Constantinople, is exactly the same with that which is said at this day at communion in all Catholic Churches, with the exception of the words, "and the Son," in the article concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit; the council said only that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, the words, "and the Son," (filioque) were subsequently added by the Western Church, first in Spain in 589. See C. Toledo, A.D. 589, and Hammond's Canons of the Church, Const. 381.

The acts of this council remaining to us are the

creed, the seven canons, and the letter addressed to the emperor Theodosius, requesting him to confirm the acts of the council—"We, therefore, entreat your clemency . . . . as by your letter convoking the council, you have honoured the Church, so now you would, by your sentence and seal, confirm the summary of its acts, and the conclusion arrived at."—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 911.

Constantinople, 382.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 382, in order to appease the divisions of Antioch, to which see Flavianus had been nominated in the preceding council, during the lifetime of the actual bishop, Paulinus. Most of the bishops who were present at that council, also attended here. Nothing certain is known of the proceedings, except that the election of Flavianus was confirmed, and a letter to the Western Church written to excuse the orientals from attending the council at Rome held at the same time. A declaration of faith was added on the subject of the Blessed Trinity as well as of the Incarnation. They further declared Nectarius to have been duly elected to the see of Constantinople, according to the Nicene canons, and that they recognized the election of Flavianus to Antioch.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1014.

Constantinople, 383.

CONSTANTINOPLE. A general assembly of bishops, sectarian as well as Catholic, was convoked by the emperor Theodosius in 383. Having read their different confessions of faith, he ended by rejecting all which divided the Trinity, and approved only of that which maintained the consubstantiality.—*Soc.* v. c. 10. *Pagi.*

Constantinople, 394.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 29th September, 394, on occasion of the dedication of the church of the apostles, Peter and Paul, built by Ruffinus, prefect of the Pretorium. The dispute concerning the bishopric of Bostra was brought before this council[1]. Nectarius of Constantinople presided, in the presence of Theophilus of Alexandria, and Flavianus of Antioch, Gregory of Nysa, Palladius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, and many other bishops of note. It was determined, that although three bishops are sufficient to consecrate, a larger number is required in order to depose.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1151.

[1] Agapius and Gebadius both claimed to be lawful bishops of this see.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 403, by forty or sixty bishops, in support of S. Chrysostom, unjustly deposed by the pseudo council, "ad Quercum," because of his non-appearance there. Although Arcadius had weakly confirmed this deposition, and banished him into Bithynia, his exile lasted but for *one day*, for the empress Eudoxia, frightened by a terrible earthquake, which happened at the time, sent after him to recall him, and he re-entered Constantinople in triumph.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1331. D. Constantinople, 403.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in the same year. After the restoration of S. Chrysostom to his bishopric, he ordered those priests and bishops who, upon his condemnation, had intruded into the sees and benefices of his followers, to be deposed, and the rightful pastors to be restored; he then demanded of the emperor that his own cause should be considered in a lawful synod. Upon which sixty bishops assembled, who came to the same conclusion with the last council, viz. that S. Chrysostom had been unlawfully deposed in the council, "ad Quercum," and that he should retain the bishopric. —*Soz.* l. 8, c. 19. Constantinople, 403.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 8th day of November, 448, by Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, for the condemnation of Eutyches. The following is a slight sketch of the man and of his errors:— Constantinople, 448.

Eutyches was abbot of a large monastery near Constantinople; he was already advanced in life when he began to publish his heresies. S. Leo speaks of him as an old man, equally imprudent and ignorant; in fact, he had neither learning nor talent, but a great deal of pride, and choosing rather to follow his own private judgment, than the teaching of the Church, with regard to the mystery of the Incarnation, he fell away. Wishing to refute the heresy of Nestorius, who maintained that the Son of the Virgin was man only, and not God, he went so far as to declare that He was not truly man, and that He had but the *appearance*, and not the reality of a human body.

According to Nestorius, the Word of God was not *made man*, in uniting the human to his Divine nature; according to Eutyches, He was made man in such a way, that the Divine and human natures being united in Him, formed but one substance and one nature. This was the distinctive point in his heresy, and all the

Constantinople, 448.

offsets from it, that there is in our Lord only *one nature*.

In order in some degree to qualify this notion, he declared that our Lord "had two natures before the union, but that after the union of the two natures they formed but one;" an error from which the most fatal consequences necessarily flow; for in taking from our Lord the reality of his human nature, he took from Him his character of Mediator, and, at the same time, destroyed the reality of his sufferings, death, and resurrection.

Eutyches seems to have been drawn into this error by degrees, and at last he spread his doctrine, not by his writings, but by means of the discourses which he delivered before the monks over whom he presided, and others. When his heresy was beginning to work its way amongst the people, Eusebius, bishop of Dorylæum, zealously set himself to oppose it, and may justly be considered as the main cause of the first condemnation of Eutyches. After having in vain tried to convince the latter of his error, Eusebius warned Flavianus of what was going on, and seized the opportunity afforded by the assembling of a council, to settle certain differences between the metropolitan of Lydia, and two of his suffragans, to present a petition, in which he accused Eutyches of heresy, and earnestly prayed that they would take the case into consideration, and cite Eutyches to appear before them, which was accordingly done.

In the second session, held November 15th, there were present eighteen bishops; and at the request of Eusebius, the letter of S. Cyril to Nestorius, confirmed by the council of Ephesus, and another by the same, were read. This done, Eusebius maintained that these letters contained the true faith, and that from them he would refute those who attacked the faith of the Church.

Flavianus declared his adherence to the doctrine contained in these letters, and further explained the faith with respect to the mystery of the incarnation: he said that our Lord is perfect God and perfect man, consubstantial with the Father as to his Godhead, and consubstantial with his mother as to his manhood; that the two natures are united in one ὑπόστασις and one person, so that after the incarnation there resulted one Jesus Christ.

All the bishops agreed to this definition of the faith, which was subsequently more authoritatively confirmed by the council of Chalcedon; Flavianus then went on to say, "If any one maintains a contrary faith, we separate him from the ministry of the altar and from the body of the Church," which sentence was unanimously approved. Constantinople, 448.

In the meantime, Eutyches, who had been cited to appear, excused himself to the deputies by saying that, on retiring from the world, he had made the resolution never to leave his monastery, and that, besides, Eusebius was his personal enemy; that as to his faith, he was ready to agree to the exposition of faith made in the holy councils of Nicea and Ephesus, and to subscribe to their interpretations; at the same time, if the fathers in those councils had been deceived, or had erred in some few of their expressions, he declared that he neither would condemn nor follow them, but that he would follow the Holy Scriptures alone, as a more sure guide than the expositions of the fathers.

The deputies having reported this answer of Eutyches, in the third session, the council judged it right to cite him a second time; and in the interval, it was proved that he was endeavouring to form a party amongst the monks of his own and other monasteries. When the deputies of the council, who were sent to cite him the second time, had arrived, he persisted in saying that he could not violate the resolution which he had made. This answer being also reported to the council, it was resolved to cite him for the third and last time, but still he refused to appear; nevertheless, he sent to the council the archimandrite Abraham, to plead his cause; he was, however, refused a hearing, upon the ground that it was the duty of Eutyches to appear in person. Subsequently, he promised to attend on the 22nd of November, and the fathers, at the instigation of Flavianus, granted him this delay. Eutyches, however, availed himself of it only to have recourse to the eunuch Chrysapius, a chief officer of the emperor; and upon the plea that his life would be in danger if he were to present himself at the council, he obtained a large escort of soldiers to accompany him there.

In the sixth session, of the 22nd November, thirty bishops being present, they demanded whether Eutyches was in attendance, and presently he arrived in great

Constantinople, 448.

state, surrounded by a large body of monks and soldiers; an officer then presented a letter from the emperor Theodosius, to the effect that he had chosen the patrician Florentius to assist in the deliberations of the council. This appointment Flavianus had opposed to the best of his power, but in vain. The letter having been read, cheers were given for the emperor, and shortly after Florentius arrived. The acts of the preceding sessions were then read, and Eutyches was questioned as to whether he believed in a union of the two natures. In his answer he declared it to be his opinion that there were two distinct natures before the incarnation. Eusebius then enquired of him whether he confessed two natures in our Lord *after* the incarnation, and that He was of the same substance with mankind as to the flesh? Feeling himself in a strait, and hard pressed, he declared that he had not come there to dispute, but to give an account of his faith, and at the same time presented a paper, which he said contained the substance of his belief. Being told to read it to the council, he refused, and Flavianus then decided that it could not be received; upon which Eutyches said that he confessed that Jesus Christ incarnate was born of the blessed Virgin, and was made perfect man for our salvation.

Flavianus, however, wishing for a more precise declaration, demanded of him whether he believed our Lord to be consubstantial with his mother and with us, as to the flesh, and to be of two natures; the first point he confessed; as to the second, in answer to a question put to him by Florentius, he said that our Lord had been of two natures *before* the union, but that after the union he recognized one nature only. Basil of Seleucia then said, "If you do not admit two natures after the union, you admit a mixture and confusion of natures." Eutyches was then told that he must anathematize every thing contrary to the doctrine which had just been read from S. Cyril's writings; this, however, he absolutely refused, saying that if he were wretched enough to do so, he should be anathematizing the fathers, upon which all the bishops in council rose up, crying out that Eutyches himself was anathema. The sentence of the council was, that he should be deposed; but before pronouncing judgment, fresh entreaties were made to him to induce him to recognize in the Lord Jesus

Christ two natures after the incarnation. Even Florentius exhorted him to confess the two natures. Eutyches, however, only replied to those entreaties by bidding them read certain writings, as he said, of S. Athanasius,—probably some spurious work attributed to him, and perhaps written by Apollinaris. Since he would yield nothing, it was unanimously agreed that it was in vain to make any further attempts to persuade him, and his sentence was accordingly read by the priest Asterius.

The sentence was to the effect that Eutyches, having been fully convicted of following the errors of Valentinus and Apollinaris, was thenceforth entirely deprived of all ecclesiastical dignity, was excluded from the communion of the Church, and deprived of his monastery; and that whoever would not withdraw from intercourse with him should be excommunicated. This sentence was signed by thirty or thirty-two bishops, and by twenty-three abbots. It is said that Eutyches, in a low voice, declared to Florentinus that he appealed to an œcumenical council, and that he gave to him, after the council was over, a petition to that effect. The condemnation of Eutyches was signed by the abbots of Constantinople, and by the eastern bishops; but the Egyptian monks rejected it. In the end, Eutyches prevailed upon the emperor to summon a council at Ephesus to try his case. [Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449.]

On the 9th of April, in the following year, the act of condemnation against Eutyches was confirmed in another council, consisting of thirty bishops.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1466 and 1470.

Constantinople, 450.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 450, under Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus in the see of Constantinople, who had died of the injuries he received in the Latrocinium, or pseudo-council of Ephesus. All the bishops, abbots, priests, and deacons at the time in Constantinople were present. The letter of S. Leo to Flavianus was read, together with the passages from the holy fathers which he adduced in support of his doctrine. Nestorius and Eutyches, together with their dogmas, were anathematized. The pope's legates returned thanks to God that all the Church was thus unanimous in the true faith. Several of the bishops who had yielded to the violence of Dioscorus in the Latrocinium, were present in this assembly, and having testified their

sorrow for what they had done, desired to condemn the act with its authors, in order to be received back into the communion of the Church[2]; they were subsequently received into communion, and restored to the government of their respective churches.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1475.

Constantinople, 459. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 459, under the patriarch Gennadius, seventy-three bishops attending. One canon, against simony, and the synodical letter, without date, remains. The Eutychian heresy, there is good reason to believe, was also again condemned.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1025.

Constantinople, 478. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 478; in which Peter the Fuller[3], John of Apamea, and Paul of Ephesus, were condemned.

Constantinople, 518. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 20th July, 518, under the emperor Justin. The patriarch John II. brought together in this council forty bishops of the neighbourhood. The abbots of the city, to the number of fifty-four, accompanied by a large concourse of the people, presented a petition, requesting that the names of Euphemius and Macedonius, and that of pope Leo, should be inserted in the diptychs or sacred registers[4]. All those persons who had been banished on account of

[2] They were not admitted to communion with the universal Church, but were ordered to confine themselves to the communion of their own Churches respectively.

[3] So called from his original trade, which he exercised in his monastic state. He usurped the see of Antioch. He was attached to the Eutychian heresy. His followers were called Theopaschites, from an error attributed to him by his adversaries, that all the three persons in the blessed Trinity were crucified.

[4] "*Diptycha*," from two Greek words, meaning a thing folded in two, because the sacred diptych amongst Christians, was a catalogue thus folded. On one side were written the names of the living, on the other those of the saints who were dead. The persons whose names were thus registered were those of bishops who had well governed their Churches, of emperors and others who had done well to the Church, or were distinguished for their virtues. The names of those who were registered on the diptych were read secretly at mass by the deacon, whose office it was; and the time when this was done was called the time of the diptych, and was just after the oblation had been made. After the secret recitation of the names, a prayer was offered for the persons, which was called "collectio post nomina."

Euphemius and Macedonius were Catholic patriarchs of Constantinople, ejected by the heretical emperor; their names were erased from the diptychs in another council held in the same year, by order of pope Hormisdas.

these two patriarchs were recalled and re-established. The names of the fathers present in the first and œcumenical councils were also inserted in the diptychs. Severus of Antioch, and some others, were anathematized.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1586.

CONSTANTINOPLE. A conference was held in 533 between the Catholics and followers of Severus; the latter were silenced, and many of them returned into the Church.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1763. Constantinople, 533.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 536, by pope Agapetus in person. Anthymus was there deposed, who had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople by the influence of the empress Theodora. He had refused to make an open profession of the Catholic faith, being opposed to the council of Chalcedon. Mennas was consecrated in his stead by the pope [5].—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1. Constantinople, 536.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in the same year by Mennas, by order of the emperor Justinian, and attended by sixty bishops, and fifty-four abbots of monasteries in Constantinople. Constantinople, 536.

In the first session, Anthymus was cited to appear within three days, and in the fifth, not having appeared, sentence of deposition was passed upon him. At the same council Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamœa, and other Acephalists, were anathematized and banished by the emperor.—Tom. v. Conc. at the beginning.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held about the year 538, according to Baronius, under Mennas. The edict of Justinian, anathematizing Origen and the errors attributed to him, was approved. This condemnation of Origen gave occasion to Theodorus of Cesarea in Cappadocia, a follower of Origen, and secretly an Acephalist, to demand the condemnation of the three well-known chapters, containing, 1. The writings of Theodorus of Mopsuestia; 2. The books which Theodoret of Cyrus wrote against the twelve anathemas of S. Cyril; and 3. The letter of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, to one Maris, a Persian, concerning the council of Ephesus, and the condemnation of Nestorius. Theodorus had flattered the emperor Justinian, that if these three chapters were condemned, the sect of the Acephalists would Constantinople, 538.

[5] Who died at Constantinople in this year, and was magnificently buried.

rejoin the Church and acknowledge the council of Chalcedon.

Constantinople, about 546.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held about the year 546; pope Vigilius, who had been sent to Constantinople by Justinian, presided, at the head of seventy bishops. This council came to no decision, owing to the fearful divisions and disputes then raging, Justinian having just condemned the three chapters. So great was the scandal produced by this act, that Theodorus of Cesarea confessed that both Pelagius, the legate who had caused the condemnation of Origen, and himself, who had caused that of the three chapters, deserved to be burnt alive for originating it. Subsequently, in 548, Vigilius gave his "judicatum," by which he condemned the three chapters, without prejudice to the council of Chalcedon. This step, however, satisfied neither the friends nor the enemies of the three chapters, and the bishops of Africa and Illyricum refused to communicate with him until he had retracted his "judicatum."—Tom. v. Conc. p. 390.

Constantinople, 553. Fifth Œcumenical Council.

CONSTANTINOPLE. The fifth œcumenical council was held on the 4th of May, 553, at Constantinople, summoned by the emperor Justinian. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were principally these:

I. The troubles excited by many of the monks with reference to the errors attributed to Origen.

II. The three chapters, and the edict of the emperor against them, drawn up by Theodorus of Cesarea; which the emperor required every bishop to subscribe under pain of banishment, but which many refused to sign, from an ill-founded fear that by so doing they should impugn the authority of the council of Chalcedon. To add to the troubles originating from this question, the pope had condemned these chapters in his "judicatum," and for so doing had been excommunicated by some of the African bishops, the most celebrated of whom was Facundus, who composed a treatise in defence of the three chapters.

The council was opened on the fourth of May, 553, in the cathedral. In the first and second sessions, which were styled conferences, Eutychius, the patriarch of Constantinople, Apollinaris of Alexandria, and Domnus of Antioch, were present, together with three bishops, deputies of Eustachius, the patriarch of Jerusalem; there were in all one hundred and sixty-five bishops,

amongst whom were five Africans, the only bishops who attended from the west. Constantinople, 553.

The emperor's edict upon the subject of the three chapters was read, in which the reasons for convoking the council were stated. In it he represents, that the four preceding œcumenical councils had been convoked by his predecessors; that the Nestorians, no longer daring to speak of Nestorius, had put forward, 1. Theodorus of Mopsuestia, his master, who had advanced blasphemies even worse than those of Nestorius; 2. The impious writings of Theodoret of Cyrus against St. Cyril, and 3. The detestable letter of Ibas of Edessa, which two latter writings they pretended had been sanctioned by the council of Chalcedon. In conclusion, he says, "As there are still many persons who persist in adhering to these three impious chapters, we have called you together to this city, and exhort you to declare your opinion upon the subject." Conference I. May 4.

Besides this, the confession of faith given by Eutychius to Vigilius was read, together with the answer of the pope, and other letters, and means were proposed for inducing the latter, who was in Constantinople at the time, to come to the council.

In the second conference the acts of the foregoing conference were read. The deputies sent to pope Vigilius made their report of his answer, which was to the effect that being sick he could not attend the council, but that he would, after a time, send his written opinion of the three chapters to the emperor. Conference II. May 8.

In the third the bishops declared that they received the doctrine of the first four œcumenical councils, and that they adhered to that of the fathers; viz. of S. Athanasius, S. Hilary, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzen, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Ambrose, S. Augustin, S. Theophilus, S. John Chrysostom, S. Cyril, S. Leo. Conference III. May 9.

In the fourth conference the question of the three chapters was entered upon, and first enquiry was made into the doctrine of Theodorus of Mopsuestia. Amongst other errors, he maintained that Jesus Christ is the image of God, that He is to be honoured as one would honour the image of an earthly prince; that He is but an adopted Son, like other men, &c. &c. &c. The fathers of the council, after hearing these repeated errors read, cried, "Anathema to Theodorus of Mop- Conference IV. May 12.

Constantinople, 553.

suestia! Anathema to his writings! This creed was composed by Satan!"

After this fourth conference, pope Vigilius gave his decree called "constitutum," addressed to the emperor, in which, first, he rejected the errors attributed to Theodorus; secondly, he undertook the defence of Theodoret of Cyrus, upon the ground that the fathers at Chalcedon had required nothing further from him than that he should anathematize Nestorius and his doctrine, which he had done; and thirdly, with respect to the letter of Ibas, he said that this bishop had been declared innocent and orthodox in that same council, although the fathers had not approved of such parts of his letter as were injurious to St. Cyril. This constitutum was signed by sixteen bishops, but it had no effect, and was not read in the council [6].

Conference V. May 13.

In the next conference, certain extracts were first read from the books of S. Cyril, directed against Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and other papers which the same Cyril had written in answer to what had been urged in his defence; then the question was agitated whether or not it was lawful to condemn those who were dead, and two passages (from SS. Cyril and Augustine) were cited to prove that it was lawful. The example of Origen was alleged, who had been condemned by Theophilus at Alexandria. The second of the three chapters then came under discussion, and extracts were read from the works of Theodoret of Cyrus, proving that he had defended Nestorius and opposed St. Cyril; at the same time it was remarked that Theodoret had anathematized Nestorius and his impious doctrine at Chalcedon.

Conference VI. May 19.

In the sixth conference were read the letter of Ibas, the acts of the council of Ephesus approving the letters of S. Cyril, and those of the council of Chalcedon approving the letters of S. Leo. Afterwards it was discussed whether the last-mentioned council had really approved of the letter of Ibas; the letter was compared with the creeds of the Church, and, amongst other things, this proposition, viz. "Those who maintain that the Word was incarnate, and made man, are heretics and Apollinarians." The fathers declared that this

[6] The "constitutum" concludes with a declaration, that it was thenceforth unlawful for any one to decree any thing concerning the three chapters contrary to what Vigilius had laid down, or even to discuss the question any further.

was entirely contrary to the definition of the council of Chalcedon, and unanimously condemned it as heretical. Constantinople, 553.

In the following conference the declarations which the pope Vigilius had made to the emperor, anathematizing the three chapters, were read, as well as the oath which he had taken to concur with all his power in the condemnation of those writings, and his letters to Valentinian and Aurelian, bishop of Arles, to the same effect. Conference VII. May 26.

In the eighth, and last conference, the sentence of the council condemning the three chapters was read; it is drawn up in these terms: Conference VIII. June 10.

"We receive the four holy councils, of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; we teach according to their definition of the faith. We condemn Theodorus of Mopsuestia and his writings, together with the impieties written by Theodoret against the true faith, the twelve anathemas of S. Cyril, and the council of Ephesus, and also those which he wrote in favour of Nestorius and Theodorus. We anathematize the impious letter said to have been written by Ibas of Edessa to Maris the Persian, which denies that the Word was incarnate of the holy Mother of God and ever Virgin Mary, which accuses S. Cyril of being an heretic and an Apollinarian, and which blames the council of Ephesus for having deposed Nestorius without examination, and defends Theodorus and Theodoret. We, therefore, anathematize the three chapters, together with their defenders, who pretend to support them by the authority of the fathers and of the council of Chalcedon."

The bishops, to the number of one hundred and sixty-five, subscribed this sentence.

To this sentence the fathers added fourteen anathemas, which contain in an abridged and theological form the doctrine of the Incarnation, as opposed to the errors which they had just condemned. Lastly, the authority of the council of Chalcedon was solemnly confirmed, while the heresy of Eutyches and the doctrine of a confusion of natures in our Lord, were unequivocally condemned. The condemnation of Origen does not appear amongst the acts of this council which remain to us; it is, however, generally believed that his doctrines were condemned here, and the fifteen canons still extant, condemning the chief of his errors, and entitled "the canons of the one hundred and sixty fathers assembled in council at Constantinople," are assigned to this synod.

The acts of this council were approved by pope Vigilius in the same year, as appears from his letter to the patriarch Eutychius, the successor of Mennas.

For a long time it was not received by the Churches of Africa, Spain, and France, from a false idea that its acts were repugnant to those of the council of Chalcedon; and pope Gregory the Great appears to have had no great veneration for this council for the same reason. In after years, when the truth of the question became more generally known, all Churches, both in the West and in the East, received this council as œcumenical.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 411.

Constantinople, 680. Sixth and last Œcumenical Council.

CONSTANTINOPLE. The sixth and last œcumenical council was opened at Constantinople on the 7th November, 680, and concluded on the 16th September, 681. It was convened against the heresy of the Monothelites, by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus. Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, a secret favourer of the errors of Eutyches, was the author of this heresy[7], whereby he hoped to revive the false doctrine of a unity of natures. The heresy of the Monothelites consisted in acknowledging only one will and one operation in our Lord Jesus Christ, after the union of the Divine and human natures. Now this error destroyed the perfection of his human nature, which it assumed to be deprived of will and operation; and it was impossible to maintain this doctrine without denying our Lord to be truly man.

Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, set himself strenuously against this heresy, and assembled a council at Jerusalem, from which he wrote a letter to the bishops of the chief sees, declaring his faith. He laboured to prove the unity of person in opposition to Nestorius, and the distinction of natures in opposition to Eutyches; then he established the true doctrine of the Church upon the subject of the two operations and two wills. "For," said he, "as each nature preserves its own properties, so each operates that which is proper to itself, since natures are known only by their operation."

S. Maximus, abbot of the monastery of Chrysopolis, near Chalcedon, was also a strenuous defender of this

[7] Or Theodorus, bishop of Pharan, who communicated his views to Sergius.

article of the Catholic faith, and laid down his life in its defence; as also did pope Martin, who, having been exiled by the emperor Constans for his opposition to the Monothelite heresy, died in banishment. Constantinople, 680.

Pope Agathos having been informed of the convocation of this council, sent thither four deputies, two priests, a deacon and subdeacon, with sound instructions. These instructions lay down in the clearest manner the Catholic doctrine, and proving by authority of holy Scripture and of the Catholic fathers, that as the Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity have but one nature, so have they but one will; but that two natures being in Jesus Christ, He also hath two operations and two wills.

The sittings of the council, in number eighteen, took place in a chapel in the palace, called in Latin trullus, i. e. the dome. The number of bishops present is variously stated, the Greek annals speak of two hundred and eighty-nine; Photius, in his book "de Synodis," says one hundred and seventy; Paul, the Deacon, one hundred and fifty. The whole number of bishops, and of priests and deacons acting as deputies, who subscribed, was one hundred. The Roman legates and the representatives of the see of Jerusalem sat on the left hand, being the place of chief dignity; George I., the patriarch of Constantinople, Macarius of Antioch, and the representatives of the see of Alexandria, then vacant, on the right. On a raised seat sat the emperor Constantine with his officers; and in the midst of the assembly, as was usual, were placed the holy gospels, upon a raised and highly ornamented stand, representing Christ himself.

In the first session the emperor was present with thirteen of his officers. Only about forty bishops were present in this first sitting, the others not having been able to reach Constantinople by the time. The legates of the pope were the first to address the council, showing that forty years before, Sergius of Constantinople had originated this heresy, which had also been encouraged by other patriarchs his successors, viz. Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter. Macarius of Antioch, the leader of the Monothelite party in the council, answered them; and, in support of his views, requested that the acts of Ephesus might be read; with which, and the remarks of the two parties upon the various passages as they occurred, the time of the first session was consumed. Session I. Nov. 7.

Constantinople, 680.

The second session was held on the 10th of November. The acts of the council of Chalcedon were read, containing the letter of S. Leo to Flavianus, in which he writes: "Each nature performs that which is proper to itself with the participation of the other. The Word operates in that which belongs to the Word, and the flesh in that which belongs to the flesh." To this Macarius of Antioch and those of his party had no solid answer to give.

Session II. Nov. 10.

Session III. Nov. 13.

In the third session, November 13th, the preface to the acts of the fifth œcumenical council was read; and the pope's legates complained that one passage had been falsified by the Monothelites, and that pope Vigilius had been made to say that there was but one operation in Jesus Christ. Upon which the emperor and many of the bishops having examined into the matter, and found it to be so, the reading of the preface was ordered to be omitted, and the acts of the council to be read; this was accordingly done, and nothing to favour the notions of the Monothelites having been found, the emperor ordered that Macarius and his adherents should prove their doctrine (according to their promise) from the fathers.

Session IV. Nov. 15.

On the 15th November the letters of Pope Agatho to the two emperors, and that of the Roman council to the assembly at Constantinople, were read. Several documents which had been falsified by the Monothelites were verified, especially those relating to the fifth œcumenical council.

Session V. Dec. 10.

In the fifth session, Macarius produced certain passages from the fathers, by which he pretended to prove that Jesus Christ has but one will, and which was identical with that of the Father and of the Holy Spirit.

Session VI. Feb. 12.

In the following session, a complaint was urged to the emperor, that Macarius had corrupted the passages adduced, and leave was demanded to compare them with the original works, from which those passages had been extracted.

Session VII. Feb. 13.

In the seventh session, the legate of the pope produced a collection from the fathers, proving the doctrine of two wills and two operations, which were read, whereupon George and Macarius asked leave to compare those passages with their own copies of the authors.

Session VIII. March 7.

In the following session, 7th of March, 681, the pa-

triarch George, of Constantinople, declared that he had compared the passages, adduced in the last session, with the originals, and found them to be correct; upon which he, together with the bishops in his obedience, declared that they received the two letters of Agatho and his council, and that they confessed two wills and two operations. Macarius of Antioch, however, refused to do the same; and being, moreover, convicted of having falsified the passages which he had brought forward in the fifth session, as from the fathers, in support of his heresy, he was subsequently anathematized as a new Dioscorus, and stripped of his pall. Constantinople, 680.

The examination of the passages adduced from the fathers having been concluded, the council addressed itself to Stephen, a monk, and follower of Macarius, to this effect: "So far are you and your master, Macarius, from having proved but one will in Jesus Christ, that we find that S. Athanasius clearly teaches two wills, although you have garbled his words according to your wont; and accordingly, having been convicted of corrupting the doctrines of the fathers, we declare you stripped of all your dignities, and of your sacerdotal office." Session IX. March 8.

In the following session, by order of the emperor, the collection of passages from the fathers, made by the Roman legates, proving the two wills and two operations in Jesus Christ, was read, and when compared with the originals found to be correct; it consisted of thirty-nine passages taken out of thirteen fathers. Session X March 18.

The letter of Sophronius of Jerusalem to Sergius was read, as were also some heretical writings of Macarius and his disciples. Session XI. March 20.

The emperor named four magistrates to appear at the council for him. By this time the number of bishops present had increased to eighty. The letter of Sergius to pope Honorius (also a Monothelite), and the answer of the latter were read, as was also a letter from Sergius to Cyrus of Phasis. Notaries were sent to Macarius to take his recognition of his writings, which he confessed to be his own. The bishops then demanded that he should be banished from Constantinople, and another elected into his patriarchate. Session XII March 22.

In the thirteenth session, judgment was pronounced in these words: "Having examined the letters of Sergius of Constantinople to Cyrus, and the answer of Session XIII. March 28.

Constantinople, 680. Honorius to Sergius, and having found them to be repugnant to the doctrine of the apostles, and to the opinion of all the fathers; in execrating their impious dogmas, we judge that their very names ought to be banished from the holy Church of God; we declare them to be smitten with anathema; and, together with them, we judge that Honorius, formerly pope of ancient Rome, be anathematized, since we find in his letter to Sergius, that he follows in all respects his error, and authorizes his impious doctrine.

Session XIV. April 2. In the fourteenth session, April 2, the investigation into the falsification of the acts of the 5th œcumenical council (viz. Constantinople, A.D. 553) was proceeded with, (see third session,) and the bishops having examined the original documents relating to the seventh session, they discovered that the pretended discourse of Mennas to Vigilius was interpolated, as well as that of Vigilius to Justinian. The council then unanimously anathematized those who had been guilty of the act, together with all who taught one will and one operation only in Jesus Christ.

Session XV. April 26. Held on the 26th April. In this session, Polychronius, a priest and monk, accused of maintaining the errors of Macarius, was called upon to explain his faith, and his explanation being altogether unsatisfactory, he was deposed from the priesthood, both as a manifest heretic, and as an impostor, in that he had dared to tempt the Holy Spirit, by saying that he would raise one from the dead in confirmation of his doctrine, and by vainly endeavouring to do so, in the presence of the members of the council and the populace.

Session XVI. August 9. In the sixteenth session, on the 9th of August, Constantine, a priest of the Church of Apamæa, in Syria, was heard in defence of his faith; he was found to follow the error of Macarius, and was driven from the council.

Session XVII. Sept. 11. In the seventeenth session, they agreed upon a definition of faith.

Session XVIII. and last, Sept. 16. In the last session, the emperor himself was again present, and more than one hundred and sixty bishops. The definition of faith was read; it declares that the council adheres to the five preceding œcumenical councils, and the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople; it condemns the authors of the Monothelite heresy, naming the following, Theodorus of Pharan, Sergius,

Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, bishops of Constantinople, Honorius, formerly pope of Rome [8], Cyrus of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, and Stephen, his disciple; that it receives the synodical letters of pope Agatho and the one hundred and twenty-five bishops assembled at Rome from Italy, France, and Britain. It further explains the mystery of the incarnation, and declares that there are in Jesus Christ two natural wills and two natural operations, without division, conversion, or confusion, or opposition, and forbids to teach any other doctrine under penalty of deposition, if a clerk, and of anathema if a layman.

After this, the anathemas against the heretics were reiterated, without any exception in favour of pope Honorius; the legate and one hundred and sixty-five bishops subscribed their hands thereto, and the definition of faith was confirmed unanimously.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 587. *Hammond's Canons of the Church. Palmer's Treatise on the Church.*

Constantinople, 691, commonly called the "Council in Trullo," also "Concilium Quinisextum."

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in the autumn of the year 691 [9]. This council is commonly known as the council "*in Trullo*," from the circumstance of its having been held in the "Dome" chapel of the palace; it has also received the name of "*Concilium Quinisextum*," as having been in some sort supplementary to the fifth and sixth councils, in which no canons of discipline were published.

In this council one hundred and two canons, forming together a complete body of discipline, were published. In the first, the council declared its adherence to the apostolic faith, as defined by the first six œcumenical councils, and condemned those persons and errors which in them had been condemned.

In the second, the canons which they received and confirmed were set forth, viz. the eighty-five canons attributed to the apostles [1], those of Nicea, Ancyra,

[8] Baronius pretends, without a shadow of reason, that the name of Honorius was *falsely* inserted in the acts of the council.

[9] By some authors 692, and by others 707, is given as the date of this council; but that given above appears to be the most probable.

[1] "*Apostolical Canons:*" eighty-five ecclesiastical laws or canons so called, and supposed by some writers to be absolutely genuine. Bellarmine and Baronius except the last thirty-five. Daille asserts them to be all a fabrication of the fifth century. Beveridge and most others deny their title to be considered as apos-

Constantinople, 691.

Neocesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicæa, and those of the œcumenical councils of Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, also those of the councils of Sardica and Carthage, and those of Constantinople, under Nectarius and Theophilus; further they approved the canonical epistles of S. Dionysius of Alexandria, of S. Athanasius, S. Basil of Cesarea, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Gregory the divine, S. Amphilochius of Iconium, of SS. Timothy, Theophilus, and Cyril of Alexandria, of Gennadius, and lastly a canon of S. Cyprian.

Canon 3. Enacts that all priests and deacons who, being married to a second wife, refuse to repent, shall be deposed; that those whose second wives are dead, or who have repented, and live in continence, shall be forbidden to serve at the altar, and to exercise any priestly function in future, but shall retain their rank; that those who have married widows, or who have married after ordination, shall be suspended for a short time, and then restored, but shall never be promoted to a higher order.

7. Restrains the arrogance of deacons; forbids them to take precedence of priests.

9. Forbids clerks to keep taverns.

11. Forbids familiarity with Jews.

13. Allows (notwithstanding the decrees of the Roman Church to the contrary) that married men, when raised to holy orders, should keep their wives and cohabit with them, excepting on those days on which they are to celebrate the holy communion; and declares that no person otherwise fit and desirous for ordination shall be refused on account of his being married, and that no promise shall be extorted from him at the time of ordination, to abstain from his wife, lest God's holy institution of matrimony be thereby dishonoured; orders further, that they who shall dare to deprive any priest, deacon, or sub-deacon of this privilege, shall be deposed, and that, also, any priest or deacon separating

tolical, but allow their extreme antiquity. What seems sufficient to establish the fact of their not being apostolical is this, that they have never been so considered by the Church, nor cited by any father or any council before that of Ephesus by the title of the "*Apostolical* Canons," but simply as the "Ancient Canons," the "Canons of the Fathers," and in the acts of this very council, as Eighty-five "Canones *nomine* sacrosanctorum et gloriosorum Apostolorum."—*Beveridge, Defence, &c.*

from his wife on pretence of piety, shall, if he persist, be deposed. Constantinople, 691.

14. Enacts that men be not ordained priests before they are thirty years of age, or deacons before twenty-five. Deaconesses to be forty.

15. Sub-deacons to be twenty.

17. Forbids clerks to go from one church to another.

19. Orders those who preside over churches to teach the people at least every Sunday; forbids them to explain Scripture otherwise than the lights of the Church and the doctors have done in their writings.

21. Orders that deposed clerks, who remain impenitent, shall be stripped of every outward mark of their clerical state, and be regarded as men of the world; those who are penitent are permitted to retain the tonsure.

22. Against simony.

23. Forbids to require any fee for administering the holy communion.

24. Forbids all in the sacerdotal order to be present at plays, and orders such as have been invited to a wedding, to rise and depart before any thing ridiculous is introduced.

32. Declares that in some parts of Armenia water was not mixed with the wine used at the altar, condemns the novel practice; sets forth the foundation for the catholic use, and orders that every bishop and priest who refuses to mix water with the wine "according to the order handed down to us by the apostles," shall be deposed.

36. Decrees that the see of Constantinople, according to the canons of Constantinople and Chalcedon, shall have equal privileges with the throne of old Rome.

40, 41. Of those who shall be admitted into the monastic state.

42. Of hermits.

The five following relate to the religious.

48. Orders that the wife of one who has been raised to the episcopate, having first separated from her husband of her own free-will, shall be kept, at the bishop's expense, in a monastery far from him, or shall be promoted to the deaconate.

53. Forbids a man to marry her to whose children by a deceased husband he has become god-father.

55. Forbids any to fast on Saturdays and Sundays, even during Lent.

Constantinople, 691.

56. Forbids to eat eggs or cheese in Lent.

57. Forbids to offer milk and honey at the altar.

58. Forbids a lay person to take himself the holy mysteries, when there is a bishop, priest, or deacon present; offenders to be separated for a week, "that they may be thereby taught not to be wiser than they ought to be."

64. Forbids lay persons to teach, and bids them rather learn of others who have received the grace to teach.

66. Orders all the faithful, for seven days after Easter, to occupy themselves at church in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.

67. Forbids to eat the blood of any animal; offenders, if clerks, to be deposed.

68. Forbids injury to any of the books of the Old and New Testaments.

69. Forbids lay-persons to enter the altar rails.

72. Forbids marriage with heretics.

73. Forbids the use of the cross upon the ground, lest by treading on it men should dishonour it.

74. Forbids to celebrate the Agapæ in churches.

75. Relates to the manner of singing psalms to be observed.

83. Forbids to administer the holy Eucharist to dead bodies.

84. Orders the baptism of those of whose baptism there exists any doubt.

88. Forbids to take any beast into a church, unless in case of great need a traveller be compelled to do so.

89. Orders the faithful to observe Good Friday with fasting and prayer, and compunction of heart, until the middle of the night of the great Sabbath.

90. Forbids to kneel at church from Saturday night to Sunday night.

111. Of penance and absolution.

The emperor Justinian first subscribed these canons. Then the four patriarchs signed, viz. Paul of Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria, Anastasius of Jerusalem, George of Antioch, successor of Macarius. Then followed all the other bishops, to the number of two hundred and eleven[2]. A vacant place was also left for

[2] Some writers assert that there were no less than two hundred and forty bishops present. The pope's legates, according to Anastasius, in his "Vitæ Sergii Papæ," were present, and signed the acts.

the signature of pope Sergius III., to whom the emperor forwarded a copy of the acts of the council; the pope, however, obstinately refused to subscribe them, pretending that the council was null and void. Some of the canons were subsequently approved by Rome, whilst others were condemned.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1124.

Constantinople, 714.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in the year 714, by Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, against Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, Paul, John, and other Monothelites.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1451.

Constantinople, 730.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in January, 730, against the use of images, by the emperor Leo, one of the most violent and intemperate opponents of the practice of adorning churches &c. with images and pictures. A decree was published not only against the *abuse*, but against the use of them, which the emperor endeavoured to compel Germanus the patriarch to subscribe, and upon his refusal he was forcibly expelled from his see, and Anastasius set up in his place.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1461.

Constantinople, 754.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 754, upon the same subject, by the emperor Constantine Copronymus. It consisted of three hundred and thirty-eight oriental bishops, and assumed the title of œcumenical; no patriarch was present, nor any deputies from the great sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. A decree was published, condemning not only the worship and undue veneration of images, &c. but enjoining the absolute rejection, from every church, of every image or picture of what kind soever, and forbidding all persons to make such in future, or to set them up in any church or private house, under pain, if a bishop, priest, or deacon, of deposition, if a layman or monk, of anathema, over and above the punishment enjoined by the imperial edicts. At the same time Germanus of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, and John Damascenus, who had by their writings defended the use of images, were anathematized. To this decree they added several articles, in the form of canons, with anathema.

This council, the proceedings of which were, at the very least, uncharitable, and at variance with the ancient practice of the Church, has, with the preceding, never been recognized by the Western Church.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1661. *Palmer's Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 200.

Constantinople, 786.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 2d August,

786, by the Iconoduli, but broken up by the violence of the opposite party.—*Ignatius in vita Tarasii.*

Constantinople, 815. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 815, by the Iconoclasts, under the emperor Leo; the abbots of Constantinople excused themselves from attending, and the monks deputed to bear to the council their reasons for so doing were driven from the assembly; also those of the bishops who differed in opinion from the dominant party, were trampled upon and maltreated. The council condemned the acts of the second council of Nicea, A.D. 787, and decreed that all paintings in churches should be defaced every where, the sacred vessels destroyed, as well as all Church ornaments. This council has never been reognized by the Western Church.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1299.

Constantinople, 842. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 842, by the emperor Michael and Theodora his mother. In this council the second council of Nicea was confirmed, the Iconoclasts anathematized, images restored to the churches, the patriarch John deposed, and Methodius elected in his stead. In memory of this council the Greek Church still keeps the second Sunday in Lent (the day on which it was held) holy, as the festival of orthodoxy.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1782.

Constantinople, 858. CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 858, by the bishops of the province of Constantinople, first, on account of the banishment of Ignatius, the patriarch of Constantinople, by the Cesar Bardas, to whom he had justly refused communion after having charitably warned him of the scandal occasioned by his irregular life. They deposed Photius, who had been intruded into the see, with anathema, as well against himself as against all who should dare to acknowledge him to be patriarch. This Photius was one of the most learned and able men of his age; but led astray by his boundless ambition, by his artifices he procured his election to the patriarchate, although a layman, and was consecrated by Gregory Asbesta, the deposed bishop of Syracuse, Dec. 25, 857. Forty days after his consecration he held a council, in which sentence of deposition and anathema was pronounced against Ignatius and his followers; and in 861 he convoked another council, at which three hundred and eighteen bishops (including the pope's legates) attended, together with the emperor Michael and a large number of lords and people. To this council

Pseudo-Council in 858.

Another in 861.

Ignatius, having been cited, refused to come, protesting against its irregularity, but some days afterwards he was seized and forcibly brought before it. After a sort of mock trial, he was condemned, and sentence of deposition passed upon him; he was then imprisoned, and subjected to great cruelties. The pope, it should be added, had been deceived into sending legates to this council, and the latter, when at Constantinople, by threats were forced to yield an assent to the proceedings of the council. Ignatius subsequently, in order to deliver himself from the cruelties which he endured, signed (or rather was *forced* to sign) a confession declaring that he had been unlawfully elevated to the see; after this he was delivered from prison, and escaped from Constantinople. Photius then wrote an artful letter to pope Nicholas to induce him to recognize his elevation to the patriarchate, which he however refused to do, and held a council at Rome (863), in which Zachens, one of the legates who attended the pseudo-council of Photius, was excommunicated, the other remanded, and Photius himself condemned and deposed (see C. Rome, 863). Upon this Photius, in 866, called together another assembly, wherein the emperors Michael and Basil presided, together with the legates of the three great Eastern sees, in which, after hearing witnesses against Nicholas the pope, sentence of deposition and excommunication was pronounced against him. Twenty-one bishops signed this sentence, and about one thousand false signatures were said to have been added. After so bold a step it was impossible to keep up appearances with Rome any longer, and he wrote a circular letter to the Oriental bishops, in which he dared to charge with error the whole West. Amongst other accusations, he charged the Latin Church with adding the words "*Filioque*" to the original creed. Subsequently, Michael died, and the emperor Basil succeeding to the sole power, Ignatius was restored to his see, and Photius driven away.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 651—2, 695, 735.

Pseudo-Council in 866.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 867. In this council Photius was deposed and driven into banishment, Ignatius, by a decree of the emperor Basil, having been restored to the see.

Constantinople, 867.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 869, by the emperor Basil, and attended by about one hundred Eastern bishops, and by three legates from pope Adrian II.

Constantinople, 869, falsely called the eighth

The council was opened on the 5th October in the

Œcumenical council. church of S. Sophia. The pope's legates, who had been received by the emperor with the most marked attention and honour, had the first seats assigned to them; the legates of the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem were also present. The first bishops who entered the council-chamber were the twelve who had suffered persecution from Photius in the cause of Ignatius; then the pope's letters to the emperor and to the patriarch were read, also the form of reconciliation which the Roman legates had brought with them.

Session II. Oct. 7. In the second session, the bishops, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons who had yielded to Photius, appeared and testified their repentance, urging, at the same time, in excuse, the evils that they had been made to suffer.

Sessions III. and IV. Oct. 11 & 13. In the third and fourth sessions Theophilus and Zachary[3] were questioned. The legates from Antioch declared that Photius had never been acknowledged by the Church of Antioch. Also a letter from the pope to the emperor Michael was read.

Session V. Oct. 20. Fifth Session. Photius himself was brought before the council and questioned. Being required to submit to the council and to Ignatius, in order to be received into lay communion, he refused to give a definite answer, and was withdrawn.

Session VI. Oct. 25. In the sixth session the emperor Basilius was present, and occupied the chief place. Several bishops who took part with Photius were introduced, and exhorted to renounce their schism; they, however, continued firm in their fidelity to him, and Zachary, bishop of Chalcedon, in a long oration, defended Photius from the charges brought against him. The emperor himself, at some length, endeavoured to persuade them to renounce Photius and to submit to Ignatius, but they resolutely refused. Ten days were granted them in which to consider of the matter.

Session VII. Oct. 29. In the seventh Photius again appeared, and with him Gregory of Syracuse; an admonition to himself and his partizans was read, exhorting them, under pain of anathema, to submit to the council. Photius merely answered, that he had nothing to say in reply to calumnies, whereupon the legates directed the sentence of excommunication against Photius and Gregory to be read.

Session VIII. Nov. 5. In the eighth session the acts of the council against

[3] Two bishops consecrated by Photius, who having refused to sign the Roman form of reconciliation, were thrust out of the council by order of the legates.

Ignatius, and several of the books written by Photius, were burned; anathema was pronounced against the Iconoclasts, and finally, the sentence of anathema against Photius was repeated. Constantinople, 869.

The ninth session was held three months afterwards. The false witnesses whom the emperor Michael, at the instigation of Photius, had brought forward to give evidence against Ignatius, were put to penance. In this session, the emperor was not present, but the legate of the patriarch of Alexandria attended. Session IX. Feb. 12, 870.

In the tenth and last session, the emperor Basil attended, with his son Constantine, twenty patricians, the three ambassadors of Louis, emperor of Italy and France, and those of Michael, king of Bulgaria; also a hundred bishops were present. They acknowledged seven preceding œcumenical councils, and declared this to be the eighth. The condemnation pronounced by the popes Nicholas and Adrian against Photius was confirmed. Twenty-seven canons which had been drawn up in the previous sessions were read; they were chiefly directed against Photius: Session X. Feb. 28.

3. Enjoins the worship of the sacred image of our Lord equally with the books of the holy Gospels, (*æquo honore cum libro S. E.*); also orders the worship of the cross and of images of saints.

7. Forbids persons labouring under anathema to paint the holy images.

11. Anathematizes all who believed with Photius that the body contains two souls.

12. Forbids princes to meddle in the election of bishops.

13. Orders that the higher ranks in each Church shall be filled by the ecclesiastics of that Church, and not by strangers.

16. Reprobates the sacrilegious use made of the holy vestments and garments by the emperor Michael, who employed them in profane shows and games.

21. Enjoins reverence to all the patriarchs, especially to the pope, and declares that even in an œcumenical synod, any matter of complaint or doubt involving the Roman Church should be treated with suitable reverence, without presuming to pass any sentence against the supreme pontiffs of old Rome.

Further, a definition of faith was published in the name of the council, with anathema against all heretics, especially naming Monothelites and Iconoclasts.

The acts of this council were subscribed, in the first place, by the three legates of the pope, (the emperor, through humility, refusing to sign first,) then by the patriarch Ignatius, and after him by Joseph, legate of Alexandria, Thomas, archbishop of Tyre, who represented the vacant see of Antioch, and the legate of Jerusalem, then by the emperor and his two sons Constantine and Leo, and lastly by one hundred and one bishops.

This council has not the slightest claim to be considered œcumenical; it was, indeed, annulled in the following council, and has always been rejected by the eastern Church.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 962.

Constantinople, 879, falselycalled œcumenical.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 879, by the emperor Basil, upon the restoration of Photius to the patriarchate of Constantinople, vacated by the death of Ignatius. The legates of pope John VIII., and of all the eastern patriarchs attended, with not less than three hundred and eighty bishops.

Session I.

In the first session Photius presided; the legate of John, cardinal Peter, declared the pope's willingness to recognize Photius as his brother, and produced the presents which he had brought for the latter from Rome. Much was said by Zacharias, bishop of Chalcedon, and others, in praise of Photius, which was greatly applauded by the assembly.

Session II. Nov. 16.

In the second session, the letter of the pope to the emperor, translated into Greek, was read, those parts which were unfavourable to Photius having been altered. The council received the pope's letter relating to union with Photius, but rejected that which claimed Bulgaria as belonging to the Roman obedience [4]. The letter of the pope to Photius was then read, that part, however, being suppressed which declared that Photius ought to have consulted him before returning to the see of Constantinople, and to have asked pardon in full council. The bishops declared that no force or violence had been used by Photius, in order to procure his re-establish-

[4] Nicholas I. had formed the project of adding Bulgaria to the Roman obedience; but in 866, Photius, during his usurpation of the see of Constantinople, annexed it to that patriarchate, and violently opposed the pretended claim of Rome. The pope John VIII. seems to have made it a condition of his acknowledging Photius, that the latter would give up his claim of jurisdiction over Bulgaria; this he promised to do, but did not afterwards fulfil his engagement.

ment in the see, and that all had been done quietly and in order; afterwards, Photius himself spoke, declaring that he had been elevated to the patriarchate against his own will, to which the whole council assented. This done, the letters of the eastern patriarchs to the emperor and to Photius were read, being all highly favourable to the latter, acknowledging him to be the lawful patriarch of Constantinople, and inveighing against the synod of 869. Constantinople, 879.

In the third session, the letter of John VIII. to the Church of Constantinople was first read, then the acts of all previous councils condemning Photius were annulled, the council declaring, "We reject and anathematize that pretended council (the preceding) in uniting ourselves to the patriarch Photius." Session III. Nov. 18.

In the following session, the letter of the patriarch of Antioch to Photius was read; it was approved by the council, which declared that the eastern sees had all along recognized Photius. Afterwards, the articles of union were discussed; they were five, 1. respecting Bulgaria, concerning which nothing was determined; 2. relating to the consecration of laymen to the see of Constantinople; 3. forbidding the election of any person to the patriarchate of Constantinople from another Church; 4. condemning all the councils held against Photius; 5. excommunicating all who refused to communicate with Photius. The last four were unanimously approved. Session IV. Christmas Eve.

In the fifth session, the second council of Nicea was approved, and received as œcumenical. After the publication of certain canons, the bishops present proceeded to subscribe the acts of the council, the Roman legates being the first, who declared that they acknowledged Photius to be the legitimate patriarch, that they rejected the council of Constantinople in 869, against him, and that if any schismatics should still separate themselves from Photius, their lawful pastor, they ought to be excluded from communion, until they would return to obedience. Session V. Jan. 26.

The sixth session was held in the palace, the emperor Basil was present. Here it was agreed to follow the decisions of the seven œcumenical councils in drawing up a profession of faith; thereby, in fact, condemning the addition of the words "Filioque." Session VI. March 10.

In the seventh and last session, held on Sunday, March Session VII. March 13.

13, in the church, the definition of faith, agreed to in the former session, was read and subscribed, after which the council was dissolved.

The acts of this council were subscribed by the emperor. This council was rejected by the western Church. John VIII. very shortly after sent Marinus, his legate, to Constantinople, to revoke his consent to its proceedings, and to declare his concurrence in the sentence of excommunication previously passed against Photius. Neither does it seem to have been universally received in the east.—Tom. ix. Conc. pp. 324, 329.

Constantinople, 1054.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1054, by the patriarch Michael Cerularius. In this council the great schism between the Greek and Roman Churches was (as it were) consummated. Cerularius had previously written a letter in his own name and that of Leo, archbishop of Acrida, to John, bishop of Trani, in Apulia, in which he publicly accused the Latin Church of error. Amongst other things laid to their charge was the use of unleavened bread in the holy communion; single immersion in holy baptism; the use of signs by bishops, &c. To this letter Leo IX. returned an angry answer, and held a council at Rome, in which the Greek Churches were excommunicated. The emperor, however, was anxious to appease matters, and by his order, Leo sent three legates to Constantinople, Humbertus, Peter, archbishop of Amalfi, and Frederick, chancellor of the Church of Rome, (afterwards Stephen IX.,) who by their own conduct fully seconded the arrogance of the pope, and in 1054, in the church of S. Sophia, solemnly excommunicated Michael Cerularius and Leo of Acrida, with all their adherents; and leaving a written document to this effect upon the altar, departed, shaking off the dust from their feet. Upon this, Michael called together this council, in which he excommunicated the three legates with all those who adhered to their views.

Baronius, in an. 1053.

The jealousy with which the bishops of Rome regarded the claim of the patriarchs of Constantinople to the supremacy over the Churches of their own obedience, was the true cause of this rupture.

Constantinople, 1084.

CONSTANTINOPLE. A council was held by Nicholas III. the patriarch, about the year 1084, in which the decree made in the council of Constantinople, A. D. 842, in favour of the use of images, was confirmed. Symeon, patriarch of Jerusalem, twenty-three arch-

bishops and bishops, together with many hegumens of monasteries, were present. The case of Leo, archbishop of Chalcedon, was discussed, and his opinion unanimously condemned, which was to the effect that an "*absolute*" worship, and not merely "*relative*," was due to the holy images. Leo himself submitted to the decision of the council, retracted, and was admitted to communion.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1118, under John IX. in which the sect of the Bogomili was condemned, and its leader Basilius anathematized and sentenced to be burned. Constantinople, 1118.

This sect took its rise in Bulgaria. Like the Massalians in earlier times, they attributed an excessive importance to prayer, and walked about perpetually muttering prayer to themselves; the Lord's prayer they repeated seven times every day, and five times in the night, many of them very much more frequently. From this habit of much praying they derived the name of Bogomili, which in the Sclavonic language means, "God have mercy upon us." In their heretical notions they resembled the Manichæans and Paulicians, which last sect arose about the same time. They affected an appearance of extreme sanctity, and wore the monkish dress. Their leader Basilius, a physician, had twelve principal followers whom he designated his Apostles, and also some women, who went about spreading the poison of his doctrine every where.

Basilius, when before the council, refused to deny his doctrine, and declared that he was willing to endure any torment, and death itself. One peculiar notion of this sect was, that no torment could affect them, and that the angels would deliver them even from the fire. Basilius himself was burnt in this year. Several of his followers when seized retracted; others, amongst whom were some of those whom he called his apostles, were kept in prison and died there.

Several councils were held upon this subject.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 20th August, 1143, by the patriarch Michael Oxytes, in which the consecration of two bishops, Clemens and Leontius, performed by the metropolitan alone, was declared to be null and void. They were further condemned as favourers of the sect of the Bogomili.—*Leo Allat. Const.* l. 11, c. 12, p. 671. Constantinople, 1143.

Constantinople, about 1143.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held about 1143. Nyphon, a monk, (who had been sentenced in a previous council to be imprisoned until further evidence could be procured against him,) was condemned for blasphemy; amongst other things, for saying "anathema to the God of the Hebrews." He was put into prison, and remained there during the patriarchate of Michael.—*Leo Allat. Const.* p. 681. *Mansi, note,* Tom. xviii. *Baronius,* A. D. 1143.

Constantinople, 1156.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1156, under the patriarch, Lucas Chrysoberges; in which the errors of Soterichus Pantengenus, the patriarch elect of Antioch, and of some others, were condemned. They asserted that the sacrifice upon the Cross was offered to the Father and to the Holy Spirit alone, and not to the Word, the Son of God. The origin of this error seems to have been the fear of admitting the Nestorian doctrine of two persons in Jesus Christ. In a subsequent sitting Soterichus confessed his error, but was judged unworthy of the priesthood.

Constantinople, 1261.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1261, by the emperor Michael Paleologus, to deliberate upon the recall of Arsenius I., the patriarch, who had withdrawn from Constantinople. The circumstances of the case were as follows:—Arsenius (Antorianus) was a monk of mount Athos, who had been raised to the office of patriarch of Constantinople by the emperor Theodorus Lascaris in 1257. Upon the death of the latter Michael Paleologus was, in the absence of Arsenius, appointed regent, and shortly after having been associated in the imperial dignity with the young emperor John, Arsenius was obliged, against his own wishes, to crown him; this, however, he did only upon condition that John should hold the first rank. Subsequently, seeing that this condition was not fulfilled, and that Michael was going on in an ill course, he withdrew from his see; to which Michael immediately appointed Nicephorus of Ephesus in 1260, who died within a few months, when Michael convoked this council to consider about the expediency of recalling Arsenius. After some debate, in the course of which some of the bishops present maintained that Arsenius had not lawfully and canonically vacated the see; and others that he had sufficiently signified his abdication by his words and actions; it was resolved to send a

deputation from the council to Arsenius, to entreat him to return, which he subsequently did, the emperor promising to forget all that had passed.

Constantinople, 1266.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1266, by the same Michael Paleologus, in which the patriarch Arsenius was deposed and banished. Arsenius, after his recall in 1261, had given offence to the emperor by refusing to acknowledge the consecration of Nicephorus to the patriarchate during his absence; and subsequently learning that Michael had cruelly put out the eyes of the young emperor John, he had boldly excommunicated him; and, upon his continuing obstinate, he had, in a council held three years afterwards, entirely cut him off from the Church. Upon this Michael grievously persecuted him; and upon a false charge of having administered the holy communion to a Turkish prince, he was in this synod excommunicated, deposed, and banished, and Joseph set up in his place. This caused a schism amongst the Greeks of Constantinople, most of them refusing to acknowledge Joseph; Arsenius died in banishment in 1273.

Constantinople, 1277.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held about the year 1277, in which John Veccus or Boccus, who succeeded Joseph I. in the patriarchate, made profession of the faith as held by the Church of Rome, and excommunicated those of the Greeks who refused to return into union with that Church. A long synodal letter was written to the pope, humbly deploring the division of the two Churches, acknowledging the primacy of Rome, and confessing the Latin faith. This, however, was not done without great opposition, and a new schism arose. —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1032. 1037.

Constantinople, 1280.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held on the 3rd May, 1280, by the same patriarch, John Veccus, at which eight metropolitans and eight archbishops were present. A passage was read from the writings of S. Gregory of Nyssa, (beginning with these words, "Cum adduceret magnus Moyses,") in which the following words occur, "Spiritus vero Sanctus et a Patre dicitur et ex Filio esse affirmatur." The word "ex," it appeared, had been wilfully erased, and thus the sense of the passage was altered, which, otherwise, would have assisted towards the re-establishment of union between the Churches, since it tended to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father. The

zeal of Veccus for a re-union with Rome, and in favour of the Latin faith, brought upon him the ill-will of the Greeks [5].—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1125.

Constantinople, 1283 and 1284.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1283, in which the patriarch Veccus was condemned; and in a council held in the following year, in the palace of Blaquernæ [6], the celebrated treaty of union agreed upon in the council of Lyons in 1274, and publicly ratified by Veccus, was annulled, and Veccus himself exiled.

Constantinople, 1341.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1341 under John XIV., patriarch, who presided [7], the emperor Andronicus the younger being present. To this council Gregory Palamas, the chief of the Quietists or Hesycastæ, of mount Athos, was cited to answer the accusation of Barlaam, a Calabrian monk (afterwards bishop of Gieræcé in Calabria). These Quietists believed that by intense and constant contemplation, it was possible to arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from perturbation; and, accordingly, they used to sit in one fixed posture gazing at the pit of their stomach, (hence the title Umbilicani given them by Barlaam,) and pretended, that when so occupied, they could see a Divine light beaming forth from the soul, and that this light was the glory of God, and the same that illuminated Christ during the Transfiguration. The event of the council, however, was that Gregory triumphed, and Barlaam was condemned, and made to ask pardon for his hasty accusation; he subsequently returned to Italy.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1872.

Five other Councils upon the same subject.

Five other councils were held upon this same subject within the nine following years.

Constantinople, about 1345 (1334 *Raynaldus*).

CONSTANTINOPLE. A council was held about the year 1345, at which the two legates from Rome, Francis, archbishop of Bosphorus, and Richard, bishop

[5] The decree excommunicating those who refused to unite with the Roman Church, appears to have been published in a subsequent council, held in the same year. It declares that the holy synod holds them as schismatics and disturbers of ecclesiastical unity, "qui non recipiunt S. Romanam Ecclesiam esse matrem et caput omnium aliarum Ecclesiarum et fidelitatis orthodoxæ magistram, et ipsius summum pontificem primum pastorem omnium Christianorum."

[6] So called from the name of a harbour near Constantinople, where it was situated, and from which the council sometimes takes its name.

[7] Raynaldus asserts that the emperor, and not the patriarch, presided.

of Chersonesus, an Englishman, were present. Their object was to enter into a negotiation for a union of the two Churches. As neither the patriarch, John XIV., nor his bishops were capable of managing the business, Nicephorus Gregorius, a learned layman, was called in, by whose advice they avoided all discussion with the legates, and the matter fell to the ground.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held about the year 1450, upon the subject of the union of the Greek and Latin Churches, agreed upon at Florence in 1439. Gregory III., patriarch of Constantinople, was deposed, on account of the consent which he had given, as he allowed willingly, to that union, and Athanasius elected to his place. This was done in the first session. In the second the unfair means used by the Latins at Florence, in order to effect the union, were dilated on. In the third the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was argued, and the Latin doctrine on that subject endeavoured to be refuted. In the fourth they discussed the following subjects : Constantinople, 1450.

1. The authority claimed by the pope over the oriental and all other Churches.
2. The fire of purgatory.
3. The fruition of the saints.
4. The words of consecration.

In all of which they differed from the view taken by the Roman Church. They then added twenty-five articles of complaints against the Latin Church.

1. That they did not paint the images like the archetype.
2. That they adapted secular tunes to ecclesiastical psalmody.
3. That they permitted men and women to sit together in their churches.
4. That they forbad marriage to the clergy.
5. That they did not pray towards the East.
6. That they used unleavened bread in the holy sacrifice.
7. That they asserted whatever is in God to be substance.
8. That the pope had that cross depicted upon his feet which Christ carried on his shoulder.
9. That they allowed the bed-ridden (cubantem) to participate in the holy mysteries, and that not with sufficient reverence.

10. That they accepted money from harlots.

11. That they fasted on Saturdays.

12. That they, contrary to the decree of the seventh synod, made paintings to represent the Father.

13. That in crossing themselves they began on the left.

14. That the pope usurped a secular authority.

15. That the pope, for money, absolved Christians from the obligation to fast.

16. That, contrary to holy Scripture, they permitted parents to make their eldest sons sole heirs.

17. That they gave to the image of Christ and to the cross the worship of Latria, which is due only to the Word.

18. That they adored images.

19. That they permitted priests, in a state of fornication, to celebrate mass.

21. That they did not at once anoint the heads of the baptized.

22. That they did not pray *standing* on Saturdays and Sundays.

23. That they ate of things suffocated.

24. That they punished with *temporal fires* those who erred in the faith.

25. That they did not enjoin those who had done any injury to any one to seek forgiveness of him.

The synod, which was numerous, ended with the following session.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1365.

Constantinople, 1593.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1593. A great synod, in which Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople, and Meletius of Alexandria presided. All things relating to the foundation of the new patriarchate of Moscow were confirmed in this council.

Up to the end of the sixteenth century Kieff, which was then the metropolis of Russia, was under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople; but about that time Jeremiah II. being at Moscow, the monks of that city earnestly besought him, that the people and empire of Moscow might be subjected to an archbishop, αὐτοκέφαλος, "qui sui juris esset;" subject, that is, to no superior. This petition the patriarch at once, of his own accord, granted, and confirmed his promise by an oath, at the same time giving a deed drawn up in the Sclavonic tongue, by which the new patriarchate of Moscow was erected; which deed was subscribed

by all the priests and monks who were present with him.

Having executed this deed, Jeremiah convoked a synod on the 26th January, 1589, in the imperial city of Moscow, composed of all the bishops and abbots of the empire; in which the Liturgy having been first said in the presence of the emperor, his wife, and the whole senate, Job, archbishop of Rostof, was elected, and declared the first primate and patriarch of the empire of Moscow.

Upon the return of Jeremiah to Constantinople, a numerous council of bishops was assembled in the month of February, 1593, by which the erection of the new patriarchate of Moscow was confirmed; and it was declared to be just and right that the state of Moscow, strictly orthodox, &c. &c., should receive ecclesiastical honours in accordance with the spirit of the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, and for other sufficient reasons there stated.

Then it was settled and decreed that the Church of Moscow should be thenceforward a patriarchate; that all Russia, with its tributaries northwards, should be subject to it in all matters ecclesiastical; and that the patriarch of Moscow should rank next after the patriarch of Jerusalem, and take precedence of all metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, throughout the whole Catholic and Orthodox Church of Christ. It was further decreed that the election of the patriarch of Moscow should be confirmed by the patriarch of Constantinople, to whom a fixed tribute should be paid. Job, archbishop of Rostof, was then consecrated primate of the empire of Moscow, and patriarch.—*Le Quien.*

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held September 24, 1638, by Cyril of Berea, patriarch of Constantinople, for the purpose of anathematizing the memory of Cyril Lucar, his predecessor, who died about three months previously, and who was accused of holding many of the peculiar tenets of Calvin. It was decreed that Cyril Lucar should be publicly denounced, and delivered over to an anathema, as well as all those who received his vain dogmas. Thirteen anathemas were then published against him, of which the following is a summary. Constantinople, 1638.

1. To Cyril, surnamed Lucar, who has falsely asserted that the whole Eastern Church is of the same belief as Calvin, anathema.

2. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that the holy Church of Christ can lie, anathema.

3. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that God hath chosen some to glory before the foundation of the world, and predestinated them without works, and hath reprobated others without cause, and that the works of none are sufficient to demand a reward before the tribunal of Christ, anathema.

4. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that the saints are not our mediators and intercessors with God, anathema.

5. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that man is not endued with free will, but that every man has the power of sinning, but not of doing good, anathema.

6. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that there are not seven sacraments, but that only two, i. e. baptism and the eucharist, were handed down to us by Christ in his gospel, anathema.

7. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that the bread offered at the altar, and also the wine, is not changed by the blessing of the priest, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, into the real body and blood of Christ, anathema.

8. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that they who have fallen asleep in piety and good works, are not assisted by the alms of their relations and the prayers of the Church, anathema.

9. To Cyril, a new Iconoclast, and the worst of all, anathema.

The 10th and 11th are merely an amplification of the last, and the 12th and 13th a recapitulation and enforcement of the whole.

The acts of the council are signed by three patriarchs, viz. Cyril of Constantinople, Metrophanes of Alexandria, and Theophanes of Jerusalem; also by twenty-four archbishops and bishops, and by twenty-one dignitaries of the great Church of Constantinople.—*Neale's History of the Oriental Church.*

Constantinople, 1641.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in 1641, by Parthenius; eight prelates and four dignitaries of the Church attended. The teaching of Cyril Lucar was again condemned, and the use of the word μετουσίωσις, authorized to express the change in the elements after consecration; but not without opposition, as a term unknown to the fathers, and the offspring of

Latin scholasticism.—*Neale's History of the Oriental Church.*

CONSTANTINOPLE (or Jassy). Held at Jassy in Moldavia, but commonly named the synod of Constantinople; Parthenius, the œcumenical patriarch, presided: and the acts of the council (which are incorporated with and authenticated by those of the council of Bethlehem, A. D. 1672) are signed by twenty-three archbishops and bishops, amongst whom was Peter Mogilas, archbishop of Kieff, the author of the "Confessio Orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ et Orientalis," which, as revised by Meletius Syriga, was formally approved. Most of the signatures, however, appear to have been added subsequently, the number of prelates actually present being small. Constantinople, or Jassy, 1642.

The decrees of this synod are contained in seventeen chapters, and the condemnation of Cyril Lucar is more fully expressed than it had been in the synod of 1638. All the chapters of Cyril, except the seventh on the Incarnation, are condemned.—*Neale's History of the Oriental Church,* Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1713.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held April 12, 1718; the patriarch, Jeremias of Constantinople, Samuel of Alexandria, and Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, being present, with the clergy of the Church of Constantinople. In this council the twelve proposals of the Scotch and English nonjuring bishops upon the subject of an union between the Greek Church and the nonjuring British Churches was considered. The circumstances which led to this scheme were as follows:—In 1716, Arsenius, metropolitan of Thebais in Egypt, was in London, and the Scotch bishop, Campbell, forming an acquaintance with him, was led to mention the subject of an union to him; Arsenius entered warmly into the matter, and undertook to forward to the orientals any proposals upon the subject which the British bishops might agree upon. Constantinople, 1718.

In consequence twelve proposals were drawn up, which were translated into Greek by bishop Spinkes; and to them was added a declaration, expressing wherein they agreed and disagreed with the Oriental Church. The five points of disagreement were as follows:

1. That they denied to the canons of œcumenical councils the same authority with holy Scripture.

2. That they could not pay any kind of worship to the blessed Virgin.

3. That they could not pray to saints or angels.

4. That they could give no religious veneration to images.

5. That they could not worship the host in the eucharistic sacrifice.

In the year 1721, "The answer of the orthodox in the East to the proposals sent from Britain for an union and agreement with the Oriental Church," was transmitted through Arsenius, who was then at Moscow. This answer was the synodical judgment agreed upon in this council; it was contained in a long paper, in Greek, accepting the twelve proposals and the articles of agreement under certain explanations, but warmly defending the Greek Church on the subject of the five articles of disagreement, and insisting upon an entire conformity in each of these particulars. At the same time they forwarded the two declarations of their Church drawn up in the synod of Constantinople (or Bethlehem), under Doritheus, in 1672, and in that under Callinicus, in 1791.—*Bp. Skinner's Eccl. Hist. Scotl.* vol. ii. p. 634.

Constantinople, 1723.

CONSTANTINOPLE. Held in September, 1723, upon the same subject. Jeremias of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, Chrysanthus of Jerusalem, Callinicus of Heraclea, Auxentius of Cyzicum, Paisius of Nicomedia, Gerasimus of Nicea, Parthenius of Chalcedon, Ignatius of Thessalonica, Arsenius of Prusa, Theoctistus of Polypolis, and Callinicus of Varna, being present.

Upon the receipt of the synodical judgment of the last council, the English bishops, in a synod held at London, in May, 1722, drew up a reply defending their former position, by appropriate passages from holy Scripture, and from the fathers, and concluding with the following proposal: "If our liberty, therefore, is left us in the instances above-mentioned; if the oriental patriarchs and bishops will authentically declare us not obliged to the invocation of saints and angels, the worship of images and the adoration of the host; if they please publicly and authoritatively, by an instrument under their hands, to pronounce us perfectly disengaged in these particulars, both at home and abroad, in their churches and in our own: these relaxing concessions allowed, we hope may answer the overtures on both sides, and conciliate an union."

In the present council this second communication of the British bishops was considered, and a final answer drawn up and forwarded, telling the Anglican prelates that they had nothing to say different from their former reply; and far from acceding to any compromise, they boldly declare, that "these doctrines have been long since examined, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the holy and œcumenical synods, so that it is neither lawful to add any thing to them, nor to take any thing from them; therefore, they who are disposed to agree with us in the Divine doctrines of the orthodox faith, must necessarily follow and submit to what has been defined and determined by the ancient fathers and by the holy and œcumenical synods, from the time of the apostles and their holy successors, the fathers of our Church, to this time; we say they must submit to them with sincerity and obedience, and without any scruple or dispute, and this is a sufficient answer to what you have written." To this epistle they added the confession of faith agreed upon in the synod of Bethlehem, in 1672. —*Bp. Skinner's Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 637.

COPENHAGEN. [*Concilium Hafniense.*] The place in which this council was held is not altogether certain; it was assembled by Peter Lukins, archbishop of Lunden, in 1425. His suffragans, and some other bishops, abbots, &c., were present. A synodal letter was drawn up for the re-establishment of discipline, and the reformation of morals amongst both clergy and laity. These rules forbid luxury, drunkenness, frequenting wine shops, carrying arms, having concubines, &c. All troublers of state or Church were excommunicated; nuns were forbidden to leave their convent without leave, and bishops to ordain any one belonging to another diocese without the permission of the bishop of that diocese.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 380. Copenhagen, 1425.

CORDOVA. [*Concilium Cordubense.*] Held in 852, by order of Abderaman, the Moslem king, who caused the metropolitans of the different provinces to assemble. In this council needless martyrdom was condemned. This was not a legitimate synod. Eulogius, who was martyred during this persecution, speaks of it as a pseudo-council, not gathered together lawfully in the Holy Spirit, but collected by the advice of the infidels, and by order of a king the impious enemy of the Christians.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 76. Cordova, 852.

Coyaco, 1050.

COYACO. [*Concilium Coyacense.*] Held in 1050, at Coyaco, or Coyace, in Spain, by Ferdinand I., of Castille. Nine bishops attended, and thirteen decrees were published, relating partly to the Church and partly to the state.

The second orders, under anathema, that all abbots and abbesses shall govern their houses according to the rule of S. Isidore, or S. Benedict, and shall submit in all things to their bishop.

3. Orders that Churches and the clergy shall be under the control of their bishop, and not under that of any lay person; that suitable vessels and ornaments be provided; that no chalice of wood or earthenware shall be allowed; that the altar shall be made entirely of stone, and shall be consecrated by the bishop [8].

5. Enjoins that archdeacons shall present for ordination only such clerks as shall know the whole psalter, with the hymns and canticles, epistles, gospels, and prayers.

6. Orders all Christian persons to go to church on Saturday evenings, and on Sunday to be present at the matins, mass, and at all the hours; to do no work, nor travel on that day, unless for the purposes of devotion, visiting the sick, burying the dead, executing a secret order of the king, or of defence against the Saracens. Those who break this canon are, according to their rank, either to be deprived of communion for a year, or to receive 100 lashes.

11. Commands fasting on Friday.

12. Forbids the forcible seizure of those who have taken refuge in a church, or within thirty-one paces of it.

There appears to be some difference in the copies of these canons.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1063.

[8] It also directs that in every church the proper priestly vestments shall be provided, viz. the surplice, amice, alb, cinctorium, belt, stole, maniple, and chasuble; also the vestments of the deacon, viz. amice, alb, and stole. Also it orders, that under the chalice shall be placed a paten, and over it a corporal of linen. The host to be made of fine flour, without any admixture; the wine and water to be pure, so that in the wine, and host, and water, the sacred Trinity may be signified. That the vestments of priests ministering in the church shall reach to their feet. That they shall have no women in their houses except a mother, or aunt, or sister, or woman of approved character, who shall always be dressed entirely in black; and that they shall teach infants the Creed and Lord's-prayer.

D.

DALMATIA. [*Concilium Dalmaticum.*] Held in 1199, by John, chaplain to pope Innocent III., and Simon, his sub-deacon, both legates of the Roman see. In this council the church of Dalmatia submitted itself to the authority of Rome. Also twelve canons were published. Dalmatia, 1199.

1. Enjoins that a bishop convicted of taking any fee for ordination shall be deposed for ever.

4. Directs that the secrecy of confession shall be kept inviolate under pain of deposition.

8. Condemns those lay persons who present to benefices, and those of the clergy who receive them at the hands of the laymen.

10. Excommunicates husbands who forsake their wives, without waiting for the judgment of the Church.

11. Forbids the ordination of bastards, and of the sons of priests.

12. Forbids the ordination of any one as priest under thirty years of age.

The acts are subscribed by seven bishops, besides the legates and the archbishop Dominicus.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 7.

ST. DENYS. [*Concilium S. Dionysianum.*] Held about the year 996, upon the matter of the tithes, which it was proposed to take from the monks and laymen, who had gotten possession of them, and to restore to the bishops. Abbor, abbot of Fleuri, opposed this measure so warmly, and raised such an opposition amongst the monks of S. Denys and their serfs, that the bishops were glad to make their escape[9], and nothing was concluded.—*Aimonus in Vita S. Abbonis.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 770. St. Denys, about 996.

DIOSPOLIS. [*Concilium Diospolitanum.*] Assembled December 20, 415, and lasted four days. Heros, bishop of Arles, and Lazarus, bishop of Aix, (driven from their sees in the troubles raised by an incursion of the barbarians,) had denounced the heresy of Pelagius to the bishops of Palestine, and had drawn up a memorial setting forth the errors of which they asserted him to be guilty, taken partly from that heretic's own Diospolis, 415.

[9] "Inter quos Sequinus Senonum archiepiscopus, primatum Galliæ in ea synodo sibi usurpans, *primatum quoque fugæ* arripuit." —*Aimonus*, whose account of this synod is amusing.

Diospolis, 415. works, and partly from those of Celestius. This business was carried before a council, which S. Augustin calls the council of Palestine, but it was in fact no other than the council of Diospolis, of which we are speaking,—the city mentioned in Holy Scripture under the name of Lydda.

Fourteen bishops attended, amongst whom were Eulogius of Cesarea, John of Jerusalem, Ammonianus Fidus, Zosimus, &c. Pelagius himself was present, but not so Heros and Lazarus, nor any person to explain the evil tendency of his works. He was supported by John of Jerusalem.

The memorial of Heros and Lazarus was read, in which many of the false propositions of Pelagius were contained; and amongst them the following: that children dying without baptism are saved, and enjoy eternal life, although they do not enter the kingdom of heaven; that the grace of God is not necessary for the performance of each particular good work; that man's free will with the law and gospel doctrine is sufficient; that grace is given according to our merits, and depends upon man's will.

Pelagius confessed some of the propositions attributed to him to be really his, but he denied the sense which his accusers put upon them, maintaining that they were capable of being understood in a sense agreeable to Catholic truth.

As to the accusations brought against him, some he disposed of by passing them over altogether, and others he evaded by so confusing the questions with a multitude of words and specious sophistry, that he bewildered his antagonists, as appears from S. Augustin's report of the proceedings, drawn up from the acts of the council. In fact, since there was no one present capable of sustaining the charges brought against him, and the Greek bishops were unable to examine his writings, which were in Latin, they were obliged to take his own word for the soundness of his views, and accordingly, after he had declared solemnly that he held in all things the Catholic faith, and had anathematized every thing contrary to it, the fathers recognized him as being in communion with the Church. But whatever advantage Pelagius derived from this council, by declaring that the fourteen bishops had approved his opinions, what S. Augustin says is true, that in absolving the *person* of

Pelagius they condemned his heresy, since he himself, the head of that heresy, was obliged to condemn it before the fathers would recognize him as being in the communion of the Church.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1529.

DROGHEDA. Held in S. Peter's Church, Drogheda, in 1554, by George Dowdall, archbishop of Armagh (lately restored to the archbishopric). In this synod various changes and reforms, introduced during the preceding reign, (that of Edward VI.) were annulled. Amongst other enactments, was one enjoining that the married clergy should be deprived; and another, ordering all rectors and vicars, unable to preach themselves, to engage a substitute to preach for them four times a year at least. Another provincial synod was held at Drogheda in 1556.—*Bp. Mant, Hist. Irish Church*, p. 240. Drogheda, 1554. Drogheda, 1556.

DOUZI. [*Concilium Duziacense.*] Held in August, in the year 871, at Douzi, a small town of France, in Champagne, near Mouzon. In this council Hincmar, bishop of Laon, was deposed and banished, having refused to answer the complaints urged against him by Charles the Bald. At the same time Hincmar of Rheims also presented a petition, filled with complaints against his nephew (Hincmar of Laon). His sentence of deposition was signed by twenty-one bishops present, and by the deputies of eight, who were absent, and also by eight other ecclesiastics. A synodal letter was written to pope Hadrian. The acts of the council are lost, but the pope's rescript, reprobating the condemnation of Hincmar, is extant [1]. Douzi, 871.

DOUZI. Held in June, 874, by order of the king. A synodal letter to the bishops of Aquitaine was written upon the subjects of incestuous marriages (an abuse then common), and also of the usurpations of Church property. At the same time Humbert, a priest, was deposed, and a nun, Duda, whom he had seduced, put to penance [2].—*Greg.* xii. *Ep.* 31, *inter* 7. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 258. Douzi, 874.

[1] Throughout this dispute the Gallican bishops resolutely refused to recognize the pretended right of the pope to receive appeals from the judgment of provincial synods; hence arose the discord between the two parties.

[2] Humbert was deposed, and sent into perpetual banishment, in a convent in some distant land, where he enjoyed lay communion only. Duda was sentenced to be flogged, and to pass seven years of penance.

Dublin, 1176. DUBLIN. [*Concilium Dublinense.*] Held in 1176, by *Vivianus*, the pope's legate, who then confirmed the rights of the kings of England over Ireland.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 483.

Dublin, 1186. DUBLIN. Held in Lent, 1186, by John Comyn, archbishop of Dublin, against the drunkenness and incontinence of the clergy. The archbishop, in this council, publicly pronounced sentence against certain of the clergy of the county of Wexford convicted of being married; they were suspended from the exercise of their ecclesiastical functions, and deprived of the enjoyment of their benefices. The Irish bishops, at the same time, were reprimanded for their neglect, in not checking the drunken habits of their clergy.

Dublin, 1518. DUBLIN. Held in 1518, by William Rokeby, archbishop of Dublin, and chancellor of Ireland. For the reformation of morals and discipline, ten canons were published.

1. Forbids the admission of priests without the consent of the ordinary; also enforces payment of tithe under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids the use of chalices made of tin.

8. Forbids the clergy to play at tennis, upon pain of a fine of twenty-four pence for each offence, half to be paid to the bishop, and the other half to the church of the place where they play.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 660.

Dublin. 1615. DUBLIN. Held in 1615, by the archbishops, bishops, and clergy of Ireland, in convocation, Thomas Jones, archbishop of Dublin, being speaker of the house of bishops. In this synod certain articles of religion[3], framed by Usher, in one hundred and four sections, under nineteen heads, were drawn up and approved, having for their object the introduction of Calvin's novelties into the faith of the Irish Church. These articles included the nine celebrated "articles of Lambeth," A. D. 1595, by means of which the same object had been attempted, but, happily, in vain, in England.

By the decree of the synod, any minister of whatsoever degree or quality, publicly teaching any doctrine

[3] "Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops and rest of the clergy of Ireland, in the convocation holden at Dublin in the year of our Lord God 1615, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and the establishing of consent touching true religion."

contrary to the articles then agreed upon, was ordered to be, after due admonition, silenced and deprived. See C. DUBLIN, 1635.—*Bp. Mant. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 447.

DUBLIN. A convocation of the archbishops, bishops, and clergy of Ireland, was held in 1634, in which it was proposed that the thirty-nine articles of religion, agreed upon in the synod of London, A. D. 1562, should be received by the Church of Ireland. This measure was strongly recommended by bishop Bramhall, and supported by the English and Irish governments. Archbishop Usher does not appear to have been very cordial in his co-operation. Dublin, 1634.

The main difficulty in the way of thus reducing the two Churches to a strict conformity in doctrine, was the body of articles drawn up and approved in a previous synod, held at Dublin in 1615. These articles the lower house were unwilling to alter, but by the exertions of the lord deputy, Wentworth, and bishop Bramhall, a canon was eventually drawn up, and, with the exception of one dissentient voice, unanimously passed, by which the English articles were received and approved, and all who should refuse to subscribe them pronounced worthy of excommunication.

No formal abrogation, however, of the Calvinistic articles of 1615 was made, which led to very inconvenient results; some, amongst whom was Bramhall, justly considering that the adoption of the English articles, *ipso facto*, annulled those of 1615: whilst Usher and many others, who favoured the doctrines contained in the Irish articles, maintained that both sets of articles were to be observed; and, in consequence, some few bishops, for a time, required subscription to both the English and Irish, discordant as they were. This unhappy state of things appears to have continued until 1641, when the Irish rebellion broke out. On the restoration of the Church, no attempt was made to revive the Irish articles, which fell into entire disuse.

In this same synod the bishop of Derry, Bramhall, further moved that the canons of the English Church should be received as well as the articles. Archbishop Usher opposed this, upon the ground that it gave too great a pre-eminence to the Church of England; and his view of the matter was so far pleasing to the majority of the clergy, (many of whom were strongly inclined to Puritanism,) that all they would agree to was, that

Dublin, 1634. permission should be granted to Bramhall to select from the English code such canons as he should consider fit for adoption in the Church of Ireland, and to add to them others constructed afresh for the purpose, so as to form a complete rule suited to the circumstances of the Church.

The body of canons so formed, to the number of one hundred, for the most part agreed with the English canons. The main differences are as follows :—

Canon 7 in the Irish code, which corresponds to canon 13 in the English, omits all special notice of the postures, &c., to be observed during divine service, and orders generally the "use of such reverent gestures and actions as the Book of Common Prayer prescribes, and the commendable use of the Church hath received."

Canon 13 in the English, was altogether omitted. No further injunction for using the surplice was made than that in the 7th canon; it is ordered to be worn in cathedral and collegiate chapels.

Canons 55 and 82 in the English code, were omitted in the Irish.

Canon 31 in the Irish code, directs that the "articles of religion, generally received in the Church of England and Ireland," should be taken for the test of the faith of candidates for orders.

Canon 8 provides for the celebration of certain portions of the service in Irish.

Canon 86 permits, in certain cases, the parish-clerk to read those parts of the service which should be appointed to be read in Irish.

Canon 94 provides for the supply of Irish Bibles and Prayer Books to churches.

Canon 9 forbids preachers to teach heretical and popish errors.

Canon 11 provides for catechizing; forbids the clergy to admit any person to be married, or to act as sponsors, or receive the holy communion, before they can say the creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten commandments.

Canon 12 lays down rules for catechizing and preaching.

Canon 97 orders the removal, with consent of the ordinary, of all rood-lofts in which wooden crosses stood, all shrines, &c.

Canon 36 provides for the union of poor livings.

Canon 43 orders the consecration of new churches.

Canon 19 orders the minister, on the afternoon before the administration of the holy communion, to give warning by the tolling of a bell, or otherwise, that persons troubled in conscience, may resort to God's ministers for advice and counsel.

Canon 49. Prohibits marriage in Lent, during any public fast, at Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and on Ascension-day.

The Book of Canons, thus settled, having passed both houses of convocation, received finally the king's assent. —*Bp. Mant, Irish Church*, pp. 483—506; *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 496.

DUNSTABLE. [*Concilium Dunstaplense.*] Held at Dunstable in 1214, by Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, to complain against the conduct of Nicholas, bishop of Tusculum, the pope's legate, who had thrust into the vacant sees prelates (it was alleged) by no means qualified to fill them, and whose power to prefer them at all was questioned in this synod. The legate took no notice of the message which was sent to him at Burton-upon-Trent, where he then was, but, with the king's consent, despatched Pandulphus to Rome, and so outwitted the Anglican clergy, and made their appeal to the pontiff of little or no effect.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 544. Dunstable, 1214.

DURHAM. [*Concilium Dunelmense.*] Held in 1220, under Richard de Marisco, bishop of Durham. Great uncertainty hangs over the date and particulars of this council. Amongst the constitutions of Richard of Durham, which are numerous, the following may be noticed:— Durham, 1220.

1 and 2. Concern the case of those that need dispensations.

3, 4, and 5. Contain instructions to archdeacons to instruct the clergy, and the clergy to teach the people in the Catholic faith.

7 and 9. Direct that the concubines shall be expelled from the houses of the clergy, and that the former, as well as the latter, be punished; among other penalties they are to be forbidden to receive the kiss of peace, and the blessed bread *(pane benedicto)* in the church.

13 and 14. Against drinking, and in favour of hospitality,

15, and several following constitutions, enumerate the

seven sacraments, forbid them to be sold, prohibit any one from admitting to the sacraments the parishioners of another clergyman, allow of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, yea, even of a father's or mother's administering the rite *without prejudice to their conjugal connexion;* the form was to be esteemed valid whether repeated in Latin, French, or English, and if any doubt existed, a form of conditional baptism was given: "I intend not to re-baptize thee, but if thou art not already baptized, I baptize thee," &c. The same number of sponsors were deemed necessary as are at present required by the English Church.

29. Directs that women be admonished to bring up their offspring carefully, and not to place them when very young too near at night, lest the babes be smothered; not to leave them alone in the house near the fire, nor in a place near water: and this duty is to be declared to them every Lord's day.

40. Forbids priests to reveal what was said to them under the seal of confession, even by such expressions as this: "I know what kind of persons ye are," or in any way.

The last constitution forbids a monk to dwell alone in his cell or elsewhere, quoting Ecclesiastes iv. 10, in proof of the peril of so doing.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 572.

Durham, 1255. DURHAM. Held in 1255, or thereabout; in which the constitutions of Walter de Kirkham, confirming and improving those of Richard of Durham, were published. —*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 704.

Durham, 1276. DURHAM. Held in 1276, in which the constitutions of Robert de Insulâ, bishop of Durham, were published. They are six in number, and all of them concerning tithes and the collection of them, with the best means of preventing disputes or fraud.

E.

Edinburgh, 1177. EDINBURGH. Held in 1177, by the cardinal priest Vivianus, legate, in which many ancient canons were renewed and some fresh ones enacted.—*Bp. Skinner's Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. i. p. 279; *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 486.

Edinburgh, 1552. EDINBURGH. Held in January, 1552, by the archbishop of S. Andrew's, in which the question was

agitated, "whether the Paternoster might be said to the saints." This matter made no small stir at the time, and amongst other places in S. Andrew's, the decision of the council was that the Lord's prayer might be said to the saints; but many of the bishops present urged the sub-prior of S. Andrew's upon his return rather to teach the people that "the Lord's prayer ought to be said to God; yet so that the saints ought also to be invocated."

The council further ordered the publication of a catechism in the mother-tongue, containing an explication of the creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer; and all curates were enjoined to read some portion of it every Sunday and holiday, when there was no sermon.—*Bp. Skinner, Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 39.

EDINBURGH. Held March 2, 1559, by desire of the queen Regent of Scotland, to consider certain articles of reformation proposed by the (so called) congregation, which were as follow:— Edinburgh, 1559.

1. That the public prayer be said and the sacraments ministered in the vulgar tongue.
2. That bishops be elected by the gentry of the diocese, and parish priests by the parishioners.
3. That insufficient pastors be deprived.
4. That all immoral or unlearned churchmen be excluded from the administration of every ecclesiastical function.

To the first demand the council made answer, "that they could not dispense with using any language but Latin in the public prayers and administration of the sacraments, being appointed by the Church under most severe penalties.

To the second: "That the canonical laws concerning the elections of bishops and pastors ought to be maintained, that the election of bishops being a privilege of the crown, with consent of the pope, to determine any thing in opposition thereto, when the queen was so young, would be indiscreet and treasonable.

To the two last they agreed.—*Bp. Skinner's Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 80.

EDINBURGH. An assembly of the Scotch bishops, convoked by John Fullerton, bishop of Edinburgh, was held July 9th, 1724, to settle the points of difference concerning the "usages." For some years past the bishops in Scotland had been divided as to the pro- Edinburgh, 1724.

priety of returning to the following usages (enjoined in the first book of Edward) :—

1. Mixing water with the wine.

2. Commemoration of the faithful departed at the altar.

3. Consecrating the elements by express invocation.

4. Using the oblatory prayer before distribution.

In this conference a paper called a "Concordate," was drawn up by six of the bishops, by which bishop Gadderar, who favoured a revival of the above usages, agreed, on his part, not to refuse the unmixed cup when communicating with his brethren, not to mix publicly in any of his ministrations, and, further, to do all in his power that all under his inspection should walk by the same rule. Again, in consideration of the other bishops having permitted the use of the Scotch Liturgy, he engaged not to insist upon the introduction of any other ancient usages unauthorized by the Scotch Church. On the other hand, the primus, and other members of the "college of bishops," (so the opposers of usages called themselves,) authorized and commissioned bishop Gadderar to officiate as bishop of Aberdeen.—*Bp. Skinner, Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 634.

Edinburgh, 1731.

EDINBURGH. An assembly of the bishops of the Church of Scotland was held towards the end of December, 1731, in which a second "Concordate" was drawn up; consisting of certain articles of agreement made between the college of bishops (as those who opposed the restoration of the ancient "usages" called themselves) and their opponents. These articles were to the following effect.

1. That only the Scotch or English Liturgy should be made use of in public divine service. That the peace of the Church should not be disturbed by the introduction of disputed ancient usages; and those of the clergy who should act otherwise, should be censured.

2. That no one in future should be consecrated bishop without the consent of the majority of bishops.

3. That no bishop should be elected to a vacant bishopric by the presbyters, without the mandate of the primus, and consent of the majority of bishops.

4. That the majority of bishops shall elect the primus for convocating and presiding only. No bishop to exercise jurisdiction out of his own district.

5. Appoints bishop Freebairn primus.

6. Relates to the limits of the different dioceses.

These articles were signed by five bishops present, and subsequently by four others.—*Bp. Skinner, Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 646.

EDINBURGH. Held August 9, 1743, on occasion of the consecration of John Alexander to the see of Dunkeld. Four other bishops were present: bishop Keith, primus, presiding. Sixteen canons, ten of which had been drawn up by the deceased bishop Rattray, were agreed to. Edinburgh, 1743.

1. Enacts that no one shall be consecrated bishop without the consent of the majority of the bishops. All consecration otherwise performed to be void, and the consecrator and the person consecrated judged schismatics.

2. The primus to be chosen indifferently from the bishops by the majority of voices. The primus to have no other exclusive privilege than that of convocating and presiding, and that under three restrictions —(1.) If the reasons assigned by him for a convocation shall seem insufficient to the majority of the other bishops, or the time or place appointed improper, the meeting to be wholly set aside, or the time and place altered accordingly. (2.) If the primus refuse to convoke a synod, when required by the majority of bishops, the latter may proceed to convoke without him. (3.) The primus to hold his office only during the pleasure of the majority of bishops.

3. No primus, under pain of suspension, to lay claim to any further power than is granted by these present canons.

4. Upon the demise or translation of a bishop, the presbyters of the district shall not proceed to elect to the see without the mandate of the primus with the majority of bishops.

5. If the presbyters of any district shall elect a person already consecrated, he shall, nevertheless, not have any jurisdiction over the district until his election be confirmed by the majority of bishops.

If the person elected be a presbyter with whom the majority of bishops, for good reasons, are dissatisfied, a new election shall be made.

6. Every bishop to appoint one of his presbyters to act as his dean. The dean to inform the primus of the

Edinburgh, 1743.

death of his bishop. The dean to apply for a mandate to elect a successor within four months after vacancy.

7. During a vacancy the nearest bishop to perform the necessary episcopal functions in the district; no other bishop to take upon him to perform any such functions without the consent of such bishop. In cases of discipline, for which no rule is found, the presbyters of a vacant bishopric to apply to the primus, who shall determine the case with his colleagues.

8. No presbyter shall take upon him the charge of any congregation until he be appointed by the bishop of the district. No presbyter nor deacon shall remove from his district without letters dismissory from the bishop. None to be ordained presbyter without a designation to a particular charge.

9. Enacts that in cases where, owing to the distressed state of the Church, the bishop of one district was compelled to dwell within the district of another bishop, and to have his place of worship there, those who belonged to his congregation, as well as his assisting presbyters and deacons should be under his sole jurisdiction.

10. Orders every bishop carefully to recommend to his clergy and to candidates for holy orders, the study of the holy Scriptures, and of the fathers of the apostolic and two following ages; and diligently to instruct their people in the truly Catholic principles of that pure and primitive Church.

11. The dean of every district to sit in all synodical meetings as the representative of the presbyters: to defend the interests of the presbyters, but to have no decisive vote. The dean of vacant districts to be chosen by the presbyters.

12. Upon the death of the primus, the senior bishop to succeed at once, and to hold office until the next synod, to be holden within four months.

13. Bishops unable, through infirmity, or pressing inconvenience, to attend at a synod, to notify the same to the primus. Bishops so absent, to be permitted to send their judgment upon the matter to be debated to the primus, signed with their own hand, and this to be considered as their canonical vote. Absent bishops also permitted to make propositions in writing, for the consideration of the synod. No synod to be holden unless more bishops be present than absent.

14. In all cases where the votes of the bishops are equally divided, the vote of the primus to count for two.

15. Any presbyter or deacon deposed by his bishop, who shall presume to perform any part of his sacred office, or to gather a separate or schismatical congregation, to be excommunicated; and any clergyman taking upon him to countenance such presbyter or deacon in their schismatical separation, to be suspended from the exercise of his holy functions during the bishop's pleasure. And such of the laity as shall adventure to adhere to the deposed presbyter or deacon, either in worship or other sacred administration, not to be allowed to partake of any Church ordinances until they be again reconciled and received by the bishop of the district.

16. Any clergyman taking upon him to marry persons belonging to another congregation, without the certificate of their proper pastor, to be suspended for the first offence for three months, for the second six months, for the third *sine die.*—*Bp. Skinner, Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 654.

Elne, 1065.

ELNE. [*Concilium Helenense.*] Held in 1065 at Elne, a city in Rousillon. Amongst other things, the Treve de Dieu was decreed in this council, by which it was enacted that no man should attack his enemy from the hour of noon on Saturday, till the hour of prime on Monday[4], under pain of excommunication; also that the holy office should be said for three months for excommunicated persons, to obtain the grace of God for their conversion.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1184.

Elvira, or Illiberis, about 300.

ELVIRA (or Illiberis). [*Concilium Eliberitanum.*] Held probably about the year 300, at Elvira, but whether in Tarragona or Betica is uncertain, most probably in the latter. Nineteen bishops were present, and eighty-one strict canons were published. Amongst the bishops was Hosius of Cordova, twenty-six priests

[4] The fearful confusion introduced by the civil wars which raged at the beginning of the eleventh century, compelled the bishops to forbid all acts of hostility under pain of canonical censures; this was called the "Trève de Dieu" (*Treuga Domini*), and was first enacted in this council. Subsequently the period of this truce was extended from Wednesday evening to Monday morning, during which time it was forbidden to take any thing by force, to avenge an injury, or to exact the pledge from a surety.

Elvira, about 300.

and certain deacons also assisted. The canons appear to be a collection from the penitential canons of Africa and Spain.

1. Deprives of communion, i. e. of absolution, even in death, those who, after baptism, have voluntarily sacrificed to idols.

3. Relaxes the penalty in canon 1 in favour of those who have not gone beyond offering a present to the idol. It allows of admitting such to communion at the point of death, if they have undergone a course of penance.

6 and 7. Forbid communion even at the point of death to those who have caused the death of another maliciously, and to adulterers who have relapsed after entering upon the course of penance.

12 and 13. Forbid communion even in death to mothers who prostitute their own daughters, and to women who, after consecrating themselves in virginity to God, forsake that state.

20. Directs that all ecclesiastics guilty of usury shall be degraded.

23. Orders that every month double fasts shall be kept, except in July and August.

These double fasts consisted of a fast on two consecutive days, on the first of which no food might be taken.

33. Prohibits the clergy from the use of marriages.

36. Declares that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest the object of veneration and worship be depicted upon walls[5].

46. Imposes ten years' penance upon apostates.

51. Excommunicates for five years the man who shall have married his wife's sister.

52. Pronounces anathema against persons guilty of publishing defamatory libels.

57. Directs that no man or woman who has lent his or her dress for any profane ceremony, shall enter the church for three years.

63 and 64. Forbid communion even in death to adulteresses who have wilfully destroyed their children, or who abide in a state of adultery up to the time of their last illness.

65. Forbids communion even in death to one who has falsely accused of crime a bishop, priest, or deacon.—Tom. i. Conc. 967.

[5] See Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive, part ii. book ii. sect. 6.

ELY. Held about Michaelmas, in 1290, at Ely, for the transaction of general business relating to the honour of God and the public good. William, bishop elect of Ely, was consecrated in his own cathedral by the archbishop of Canterbury, and a fifteenth part of all their goods was voted by the clergy to supply the necessities of the Royal Exchequer.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 173. Ely, 1290.

EMBRUM. [*Concilium Ebrædunense.*] Held in 1727, by M. de Tencir, archbishop of Embrum, and subsequently cardinal, upon occasion of the publication of a *Pastoral Instruction* by the bishop of Senez, in the preceding year. Eighteen bishops attended, four belonging to the province of Embrum, and ten from those in the immediate neighbourhood. They declared the Pastoral Instruction to be rash, scandalous, seditious, injurious to the Church, to the bishops, and to the royal authority; schismatical, full of error, and calculated to foment heresy. The bishop of Senez himself was suspended from all episcopal power and jurisdiction, and from the exercise of both sacerdotal and episcopal offices. —*Conc. Ebræd.*, in 4to., published in 1728, Paris. Embrun, 1727.

ENGLAND. [*Concilium Britannicum.*] Held in 516, by all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of the country, on the occasion of the coronation of king Arthur. S. Dubritius desiring to devote himself to a hermit's life resigned the archiepiscopal seat, and David was elected in his stead.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1562. England, 516.

ENGLAND. Held in 519, by S. David, bishop of Caer-leon, against the Pelagians. About this time, and probably in this council, the see was transferred from Caer-leon to Menevia (afterwards S. David's).—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1590. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 8. England, 519.

ENGLAND. Held in 603, by S. Augustin, probably near Bangor Iscoed, in the open air. This was properly a conference between Augustine and the bishops of the British Church. Seven Welsh bishops, and two from Cornwall and Somerset, attended with Dunod, abbot of the monastery of Bangor Iscoed, and several doctors. S. Augustine proposed to them to receive their Churches into union if they would agree to the following propositions:— England, 603.

1. To keep the feast of Easter with the Roman

Church, and on the first Sunday after the fifteenth day of the moon.

2. To administer holy baptism after the use of the Roman Church, by three immersions.

3. Unite with them in preaching the Gospel to the Anglo-Saxons.

These terms the British bishops refused, as well as his demand to be recognized as primate, and S. Augustine at his departure warned them of the sorrows which he foresaw to be in store for their Church[6]. As he died in 604, this council must have been held shortly before that date.—*Churton's Early Eng. Church*, p. 42. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 26, 27.

England, 693. ENGLAND. Held about 693[7], by Ina, king of the W. Saxons, during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury. Hedda, bishop of Winchester, and a large assembly of the "servants of God" were present, besides many aldermen and other laymen. Seventy-five laws were passed, many of which refer to temporal matters, and fourteen to ecclesiastical affairs.

2. Orders children to be baptized within thirty nights.

3. Forbids work on Sundays.

5. Establishes the privilege of sanctuary afforded by Churches.

6. Fines, to the amount of one hundred and twenty shillings, a person who shall fight in a minster; inflicts various fines for fighting in different situations.

12. Requires one hundred and twenty shillings, for satisfaction, for breaking into a bishop's house; the same for breakiug into the king's.

It is probably this council which Bede speaks of as having been called by king Ina, to effect a union between the British and Saxon Christians, who still differed in many usages.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 58.

England, 908. ENGLAND. Held about 908, by king Edward the elder, the son of Alfred; Plegemund, archbishop of

[6] The subsequent slaughter of the monks of Bangor is well known; but there is no good reason to suppose St. Augustine to have instigated it, as some have asserted.

[7] The date is uncertain, and the number of the laws differently stated by different authors. See Inett's Origines Anglicanæ, vol. i. chap. viii. p. 119.

Canterbury, presiding. The bull of pope Sergius III. was read, complaining of the long vacancy of several episcopal sees, and enacting, "that for the future, when any bishop dies, there shall be no delay in placing another in his stead."

In consequence, West-Saxony was divided into five dioceses instead of two, and bishops nominated to fill them. The three new sees were those of Wells, St. Petroc's, or Bodmin, and Crediton.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons. Wharton, Anglia Sacra,* vol. i. p. 209.

England, 969.

ENGLAND. Held in 969, by S. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury. Bishops from all parts of England attended, to whom the archbishop spoke at length concerning the irregular conduct of the clergy, especially denouncing their dissolute habits and indecent gestures; their negligence in celebrating Divine service, scarcely condescending to attend at Vigils, and coming to mass only to laugh; also their devotion to every kind of sensuality.

It was then decreed that all canons, priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, should observe the law of continence, or be deprived.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 698. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 247.

Eanham, 1009.

EANHAM. [*Concilium Ænhamense.*] Held about 1009, at the command of king Ethelred, by S. Alfeage, archbishop of Canterbury, at Eanham (probably Ensham in Oxfordshire), at Whitsuntide; many bishops, abbots, and laymen, were present. Thirty-two canons and laws were published.

1. Relates to the duties of abbots and abbesses, and regulars.

2. Enjoins chastity upon priests.

6. Forbids to sell a Christian into a foreign land.

7. Forbids to condemn Christians to death for every trifling cause.

8. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree.

9. Declares the protection of the Church, and of the king's hand, to be equally inviolable.

10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Relate to the payment of various church dues and fees.

15. Orders the due observation of fasts and festivals, except the fast before the feast of S. Philip and S. Jacob, which was not necessarily to be observed, by reason of the Paschal feast.

16. Commands the observance of the Ember fasts.

17. Orders men to fast on every Friday, except it be a festival.

18. Forbids the ordeal and oaths, and marriages, on high festivities, on Ember days, from Advent to the Octave of the Epiphany, and from Septuagesima to the fifteenth night after Easter.

19. Allows a widow to marry again twelve months after her husband's death.

20. Orders every man to confess often, and to communicate at least thrice a year.

21. Enumerates various sins to be avoided by Christian people.

30. Charges "God's servants" to be careful in their lives, to be chaste, and to follow their books and prayers, &c. &c.

31. Commands that the money arising from the satisfaction by an offender for his fault, shall, at the bishop's discretion, be applied to the relief of the poor, the repairing of churches, providing bells, vestments, and the like.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 789. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 285.

Epaone, or Épaune, 517.

EPAONE (or EPAUNE). [*Concilium Epaonense, Epaunense, Pomense*, or *Poumense.*] Supposed to be Yene, in the diocese of Bellay. Avitus of Vienne convoked this council under Sigismond, king of Burgundy, whom he had converted from the Arian heresy. Twenty-seven bishops, all from the kingdom of Burgundy, attended; amongst whom were Viventiolus of Lyons, Apollinaris of Valence, Gregory of Langres, &c. Avitus, in the letter of convocation, complains of the neglect of councils, and states that the pope had censured him upon that account. Forty canons were published.

3. Forbids the ordination of persons who have done open penance.

4. Forbids the clergy to keep dogs or birds for sport.

15. Separates from communion any clerk guilty of eating with a heretical clerk.

21. Forbids the consecration of widows to be deaconesses.

25. Forbids to place the relics of saints in rustic oratories, unless the neighbouring clergy can honour the sacred ashes with chanting.

30. Forbids incestuous marriages. Forbids any one

to marry his brother's widow, who is already almost his sister, or the own sister of his wife, or his step-mother, or cousin-german, or the widow or daughter of his uncle, or the children of his paternal uncle, or any of his own blood. Allows those already so married, either to keep their wives, or to form a new and lawful marriage [8].

35. Enjoins all Christian persons to go and receive the blessing of their bishop on the nights of Christmas and Easter.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1573.

Mansi, in his Supplement to the Collection of Labbe, says, that to the canons of this council should be added that which forbids bishops and priests to celebrate the holy Eucharist in unconsecrated houses.

Ephesus, 196.

EPHESUS. [*Concilium Ephesinum.*] Held in 196, under Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, where it was ruled that Easter should be celebrated on the fourteenth day of the moon, on whatever day of the week it might be. A letter from Polycrates to Victor, bishop of Rome, is extant in Eusebius, in which he defends this practice. See C. Palestine, 195.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 598. *Euseb. Hist.* v. 23, 24.

Ephesus, 401.

EPHESUS. Held in 401, by S. Chrysostom, at the head of seventy bishops, from Asia and Lydia. Heraclidus was here consecrated bishop of Ephesus. Six simoniacal bishops were deposed, upon the testimony of witnesses and their own confession, and others elected to succeed them.—*Palladius, Dial.* c. 15, p. 135. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1222.

Ephesus, 431. Third Œcumenical Council.

EPHESUS. The third œcumenical council was held at Ephesus in 431, upon the controversy raised by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who declaimed against the title of Θεοτόκος, which the Church applied to the blessed Virgin, as the mother of Him who was both God and man.

To understand fully the circumstances which led to the convocation of this council, it is necessary to relate something of the previous history of Nestorius.

As soon as Nestorius had been elevated to the see of Constantinople, he evinced a most violent zeal against all heretics, and carried on matters against them with great vehemence and indiscretion. He destroyed a church in which the Arians were accustomed to hold

[8] See C. Agde, A.D. 506, canon 61.

Ephesus, 431.

their meetings, and in various ways persecuted all sects of heretics. The way in which he attacked the Quartodecimani occasioned great commotions amongst the Sardians, in which many lives were lost. By this conduct, according to Socrates, he rendered himself very odious; but his excessive zeal for the truth, as it afterwards appeared, was only assumed, in order the more securely to introduce his own heresy [9], which asserted two persons in Christ; and that by his two natures, we are to understand that He was, in fact, no more than a perfect man, connected by a moral and apparent union with the Word. That is to say, that the Word was, indeed, united to man, but was not *made man*. Christ was not born of the Virgin, and never suffered death. And so that the Virgin was not Theotokos, the mother of *God*, but the mother of *the man;* or, as he expressed it, of *Christ;* intending by the word Christ not the God-man, but the man connected with God. He asserted, moreover, that by reason of this connexion, it was lawful to worship Jesus Christ as God, and to attribute to Him those titles and attributes which holy Scripture and the Church have assigned to Him; but still that all this was done in an improper sense; as, for instance, in holy Scripture [1] Moses is said to be a god unto Pharaoh. He even allowed the use of the expression, "mother of God," provided those who did use it confessed that it was in an improper sense, and only because Jesus Christ was the temple of God. In answer to objections brought against him, he distinguished *the Word* from the *Son of God*, declaring Jesus Christ to be the Son of God and Emmanuel, but not the Word. Thus the main point in his heresy was that the Son of God was connected with the Son of man, but was not *made* the Son of man.

Although he endeavoured at first to propagate his error secretly, and in an obscure and ambiguous manner, he eventually determined to proclaim it openly; and an opportunity was afforded him by Anastasius, a priest, who, in a sermon, boldly maintained that "no one should presume to call Mary the mother of God; for that she was but a woman, and it was impossible

[9] "Anathema Nestorio neganti ex Virgine Deum natum, adserenti duos Christos et, explosa Trinitatis fide, Quaternitatem nobis introducenti."—*Vin. Lirin.* chap. xvi.

[1] See Exod. vii. 1.

that God should be born of a woman." This assertion produced a great sensation everywhere; but, notwithstanding, Nestorius openly supported the doctrine of Anastasius in his sermons; and declared, that to call the Virgin the mother of God, was nothing less than to justify the follies of the Pagans, who attributed mothers to their gods. Upon this, certain of the clergy and monks of Constantinople expressed a desire to learn from himself whether he really confessed the doctrines imputed to him, which they maintained to be contrary to the Catholic faith: Nestorius, however, caused them to be seized, beaten, and thrust into prison. Ephesus, 431.

In spite, however, of his violence and insolence, a simple layman had the boldness to enter the lists against him, maintaining "that the *same Word* born of the Father before all worlds, was born a second time of the Virgin after the flesh;" but although this champion of the true faith received great praise, the heresy of Nestorius continued to spread everywhere, especially by means of his Homilies, which were carried to all parts, and penetrated even into the deserts in which the monks dwelt. It was upon this occasion that S. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, fearing lest these errors should take root amongst them, wrote his letter to the hermits.

Nestorius, perceiving the storm which was now rising against him, thought to turn it aside by convoking a pseudo-council, in which he deposed many of the clergy as followers of the Manichæans, and sentenced them to be exiled; for, secure of the emperor's protection and countenance, he acted with the utmost boldness and insolence. But S. Cyril, determined to persevere in his opposition to the new heresy, addressed a letter to the emperor (Theodosius) and his sister, in which, after having refuted all the heresies which had appeared upon the subject of the Incarnation, he stated and proved the real faith of the Church, in opposition to those who endeavoured to divide, as it were, Jesus Christ into two persons; meaning Nestorius, although he did not name him. At the same time, in order to arrest the progress of the heresy, he assembled a council at Alexandria, which was attended by the bishops of Egypt, to whom he communicated the letters that had passed between himself, the pope, and Nestorius. The result was the celebrated synodal letter

Ephesus, 431. containing the twelve anathemas of S. Cyril. At the same time (430) the doctrines of Nestorius were condemned in a council held at Rome.

The dispute had now become so hot and general, that both parties applied to the emperor, demanding an œcumenical council, as the only means of settling it. This he accordingly granted, and addressed a circular letter of convocation to all metropolitans, declaring that he had appointed Ephesus to be the place of assembling, and commanding them to attend at the following Whitsuntide, with their suffragans, but not in too great numbers. At the same time he wrote especially to S. Augustine to entreat him to attend, but he was already dead when the letter arrived at Carthage.

Celestine, the pope, not seeing fit to attend in person, sent three legates, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philip, a priest.

Amongst the first who arrived at the council was Nestorius, with a numerous body of followers, and accompanied by Ireneus, a nobleman, his friend and protector. S. Cyril also, and Juvenal of Jerusalem came, accompanied by about fifty of the Egyptian bishops; Memnon of Ephesus had brought together about forty of the bishops within his jurisdiction; and altogether more than two hundred bishops were present. Candidianus, the commander of the forces in Ephesus, attended, by order of the emperor, to keep peace and order; but by his conduct he greatly favoured the party of Nestorius.

The day appointed for the opening of the council was June the 7th; but John of Antioch, and the other bishops from Syria and the East not having arrived, it was delayed till the 22nd of the same month.

During this interval S. Cyril examined the question of the Incarnation, and made extracts from the books of Nestorius. Memnon of Ephesus entirely adopted the views of Cyril. The partisans of Nestorius, on the other hand, complained of certain injuries which had been done them by the clergy and by some Egyptian sailors; and there is no doubt that the people of Ephesus were inclined to the Catholic side, and strongly opposed to Nestorius and his party.

Meanwhile Nestorius, in the course of his conversations with the bishops, manifested more and more the venom of his heresy; and, in answer to those who

proved to him from the holy Scriptures, that Jesus Christ was truly God, and was born of the blessed Virgin after the flesh, impiously declared, that "he could not call an infant of two or three months old *God*, or bring himself to adore a sucking-child." Ephesus 431.

The delay of John of Antioch, and the other eastern bishops with him, in coming to the council, troubled the Catholics, for he was known to be the friend of Nestorius, and his absence was attributed to the fear of seeing Nestorius deposed. There is reason to believe that John did, in fact, hope by his delays to wear out the patience of the bishops, so that in the end the matter might fall to the ground. It is true that he protested to the emperor, upon his arrival, that he had made all the haste in his power, and had accomplished the journey from Antioch to Ephesus in forty days: but his excuses were looked upon as mere pretexts. Previously to his arrival, Cyril and his followers, when the 22nd June drew nigh, took measures for the opening of the council on that day, as had been settled, judging that they had waited long enough for the oriental bishops; and although this was warmly opposed by Nestorius and sixty-eight of the bishops, who, with Candidianus, insisted upon waiting for the arrival of John and the others, Cyril prevailed; and on the 22nd June, 431, the council assembled in the church of the holy Mother of God at Ephesus. Every thing was done with regularity, and in order; S. Cyril presided, and was styled by the council the head of all the bishops assembled. After him came Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavianus of Philippi, Firmus of Cesarea, Memnon of Ephesus, Acacius of Melita, Theodore of Ancyra, and the others according to their rank and dignity, to the number of one hundred and ninety-eight; most of them being from Greece, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Egypt. The holy gospels were placed in the midst of the assembly, signifying the presence of Christ himself.—*Soc.* l. 7, c. 29, p. 370, c. d. &c.

As soon as the bishops were assembled, a further, but ineffectual, effort was made to stay proceedings until the arrival of those that were absent. They then proceeded to business; and, in the first place, the letter of the emperor, convoking the council, was read. The answer of Nestorius to the citation of the council, was then declared, viz. that he would come if he judged Session I. June 22,

Ephesus, 431.

it necessary; but in order that the matter might be carried on canonically, before any of the papers relating to the affair were read, they deputed three bishops to bear to Nestorius a second monition to appear before the council, and to give an account of his faith. The deputies, upon their arrival at his house, found it surrounded by armed soldiers, and could not get to speak with him; he, however, caused them to be informed, that when all the bishops had arrived he would appear before the council. A third citation was then made, with no better success. After this the fathers resolved to think only of the defence of the true faith, following strictly the canons of the Church. These were read.

1. The Nicene Creed, according to custom, as being the rule of faith.

2. Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, of which the fathers highly approved.

3. The answer of Nestorius to this letter, which the fathers vehemently declared to be heretical, and at variance with the true faith, as contained in the creed.

4. Twenty articles selected out of the works of Nestorius, containing a collection of passages from his sermons; these the fathers declared to be "*horrible blasphemies;*" and with one voice exclaimed, "Anathema to the heretic Nestorius, and to all who refuse to anathematize him!"

5. The last letter of S. Cyril to Nestorius, containing the twelve anathemas; upon which nothing was said.

6. Various passages from the fathers, showing what was their doctrine upon the subject of the Incarnation; which the fathers of the council declared entirely coincided with their own faith.

Seventhly, the depositions of those bishops who had heard the impious doctrine of Nestorius from his own mouth, were received.

After all these documents had been read and commented upon, sentence was given in these terms:—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, whom Nestorius hath blasphemed, hath declared by this holy synod, that he is deprived of all episcopal dignity, and cut off from all part in the priesthood, and from every ecclesiastical assembly [2]."

[2] More than two hundred bishops signed this sentence, which was transmitted to Nestorius with the following letter:—

This sentence was signed by one hundred and ninety-eight bishops, according to Tillemont, and by more than two hundred according to Fleury; it was immediately made known to Nestorius, and published in the public places, causing an extreme joy throughout the city. At the same time, notice of it was sent to the clergy and people of Constantinople, with a recommendation to them to secure the property of the Church for the successor of the deprived Nestorius. As soon, however, as Nestorius had received notice of this sentence, he protested against it, and all that had passed at the council; and forwarded to the emperor an account of what had been done, artfully drawn up, to prejudice the latter against the council, and setting forth that Cyril and Memnon, refusing to wait for John and the other bishops, had hurried matters on in a tumultuous and irregular way, and with evident signs of hatred against himself. Ephesus, 431.

In order, therefore, to do away with the bad impression which such an account could not but make upon the emperor, the fathers deemed it right to forward to him the acts of the council; but the friends of Nestorius at Constantinople contrived to keep from the emperor's presence all who came to him on the part of the council, whilst, on the other hand, Candidianus made use of violence against the bishops, surrounded them with guards, and prevented them from sending any other persons from Ephesus to the court.

In the midst of these proceedings, John of Antioch arrived at Ephesus, followed by twenty-seven bishops, and escorted by a band of soldiers; affronted that the council had not delayed its proceedings until he arrived, he gave the most violent and irregular tokens of his displeasure, refusing to admit to his presence the deputies whom the council sent to him to inform him of what had been done, and even causing the bishops to be repulsed from his door by soldiers. June 27.

Meanwhile he assembled a mock council, with Nes-

"The holy synod convoked by our most religious and Christian emperor, and, by the grace of God, held in the metropolis of Ephesus, to Nestorius, the new Judas.

"Know, that on account of thy impious discourses and obstinate contumacy against the sacred canons, thou wast canonically declared by the holy synod to be deposed, and deprived of every ecclesiastical dignity, on the 22nd day of this present June."

Ephesus, 431.

torius and his orientals, amounting altogether to about forty bishops, who took upon themselves to judge and condemn the proceedings of the council of Ephesus; to depose S. Cyril and Memnon, and to separate from communion the rest of the two hundred bishops composing it.

This being done, John admitted the deputies of the council; but no sooner had they opened the object of their mission than the bishops of the party of John, with Ireneus, began to load them with abuse, and even to offer them bodily violence; upon which they retired, carrying to the council their complaints of the manner in which they had been treated. The fathers, shocked at such a proceeding, immediately declared John to be separated from communion, until he should appear before them and justify himself; at the same time, they testified their contempt for the sentence of his mock council. Nestorius and his party, having written to the emperor, in justification of their proceedings, the latter, prejudiced by Candidianus, addressed a letter to the fathers of the council, in which he declared his disapproval of the deposition of Nestorius, and stated that he would suffer no bishop to leave Ephesus, until the question about doctrine had been settled. In reply to this, the fathers justified their proceedings, and complained of the false reports of Candidianus.

The party of John, elated by the emperor's letter, made an attempt to consecrate a new bishop for Ephesus, in the place of Memnon; but as soon as their design got wind, the gates of the church were barred with all haste, and they were obliged to retire in confusion. In the meantime, although the party of Nestorius endeavoured to hinder all egress from Ephesus, the fathers contrived to get a letter conveyed in a hollow stick to the monks and clergy of Constantinople, who having received it, resolved to wait upon the emperor in a body, with the abbot Dalmatius, who for forty-eight years had not quitted his monastery, at their head.

The letter having been presented to the emperor, and a true version of the proceedings at Ephesus laid before him, he testified his satisfaction at what had been done by the council; upon which the party of John and Nestorius immediately sent count Ireneus to the emperor with various letters to support their cause. Dalmatius,

however, and the clergy of Constantinople, wrote to the fathers at Ephesus, telling them what they had done, and testifying their joy at the deposition of Nestorius. Ephesus, 431.

The presence of Ireneus at Constantinople again marred the prospects of the orthodox party. This nobleman was entirely devoted to the cause of Nestorius and John, and by his false statements renewed the emperor's former prejudices against the council, or rather, reduced him to a complete state of indecision, which resulted in his confirming the deposition both of Nestorius and of S. Cyril and Memnon, and annulling all else that had been done by either party; at the same time he sent count John to Ephesus to regulate matters according to the best of his judgment.

Before the next session, the deputies of the bishop of Rome arrived, and on the 10th of July the council sat again. When the letter of Celestinus to the council had been read, the legates were informed of the preceding acts of the council, and declared their assent to the sentence passed against Nestorius. Sessions II. and III. July 10 & 11.

On the 16th of July, in the fourth sitting, a petition was received from S. Cyril and Memnon, demanding justice in the matter of the sentence pronounced against them by John of Antioch and the Syrian bishops. The council directed that these last should be summoned to appear; but the bishops sent to execute the summons were repulsed by soldiers. A second citation having been made, John declared that he could give no answer to men who were deposed and excommunicated. Session IV. July 16.

In the following session, the deputies who were sent with a third citation to John of Antioch, were met by the archdeacon of Nestorius, who desired to give them a paper; but upon their judging it right to refuse this, he declared that as they would not receive his memorial, he would pay no further regard to the council, but wait for the emperor's decision. Subsequently, the council proceeded to separate from communion, John of Antioch and his Syrian followers, to the number of thirty-three, amongst whom was Theodoret. To this sentence it was added, that, unless they speedily made acknowledgment of their fault, the extreme penalty would be inflicted upon them. Session V. July 17.

In this session, probably, six canons were drawn up against the Syrians and Nestorians; they contain no-

Ephesus, 431. thing whatever relating to the public discipline of the Church [3].

Session VI. July 22. In the sixth session, July 22, S. Cyril presided. The council condemned the creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia, (not, however, naming that bishop,) and strictly forbad any person to compose, or cause to be signed by those who would enter the Church, any other creed or confession of faith than that of Nicea, under pain of deposition, if an ecclesiastic, and of anathema, if a layman.

Session VII. and last, Aug. 31. In the seventh session, August 31, the petition of Regius, bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, was read, in which he complained of the encroachments upon his rights made by the Church of Antioch, in arrogating the right of ordination contrary to canon and universal custom. The sentence of the council was to the effect that the bishops of Cyprus should be left in free possession of the right of consecrating their own bishops, according to canon and custom, unless the patriarch of Antioch could prove that the privilege he claimed was founded upon ancient usage; but since the latter was not present in the council, he could not defend his case.

Shortly after this session, count John, who had been sent by Theodosius, arrived at Ephesus, and appointed the bishops of both synods to meet him on the following day. Accordingly, John of Antioch and Nestorius attended with their party, and S. Cyril with the Catholics; but immediately a dispute arose between them, the latter justly contending that Nestorius should not be present, whilst the former wished to exclude S. Cyril. Upon this, the count, to quiet matters, gave both Cyril and Nestorius into custody, and then endeavoured, but in vain, to reconcile the two parties. And thus matters seemed as far from a settlement as ever; in the meanwhile, the emperor endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the two parties, by obliging the orthodox bishops to communicate with the Syrians; this, however, the former positively refused to do, until the latter should cease from their evil conduct towards Cyril and Memnon, and would consent to anathematize Nestorius and his doctrines.

[3] Dionysius Exiguus has omitted these canons. Beveridge attributes them to this synod. They may be found in Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. ii. p. 123.

At last the Syrian party made a move towards restoring the peace of the Church, and rendered an account of their belief upon the subjects of the Incarnation and of the Blessed Virgin, which was found to be sound and Catholic, and was subsequently of great use in pacifying the troubles which had arisen. On the other hand, the fathers of the council wrote to the emperor in behalf of Cyril and Memnon, laying before him the true state of the case. They were warmly seconded by the orthodox party in Constantinople, with whom they had also communicated, and who did not hesitate to proclaim openly their sympathy for the two persecuted bishops, and addressed to the emperor a very forcible petition in the name of all the clergy, setting before him, amongst other things, that by condemning in Nestorius the whole of his party, and in S. Cyril and Memnon all the Catholics, he had, in fact, left every thing open to the Arians and Eunomians. They concluded by declaring that they were ready to suffer every thing, even martyrdom, with those who maintained the same true faith as themselves. Ephesus, 431.

Worked upon by these representations, the emperor at last permitted the fathers of the council to send to him eight deputies, whilst the Orientals or Syrians, on their part sent as many; the place of meeting was Chalcedon, whither the emperor proceeded, and spent five days in listening to the arguments on both sides; and here the council of Ephesus may, in fact, be said to have terminated; nothing is known of what passed at Chalcedon, but the event shows that Theodosius was convinced by the arguments of the Catholics, since upon his return to Constantinople he ordered, by a letter, the Catholic deputies to come there, and to proceed to consecrate a bishop in the place of Nestorius, whom he had already ordered to leave Ephesus, and to confine himself to his monastery near Antioch. Afterwards, he directed that all the bishops at the council, including S. Cyril and Memnon, should return to their respective dioceses.

The judgment of this council was at once approved by the whole western Church, and by far the greater part of the east; and was subsequently confirmed by the œcumenical council of Chalcedon, consisting of six hundred and thirty bishops. Even John of Antioch, and the eastern bishops, very soon acknowledged it. It has ever been regarded by every branch of the true Church as œcu-

menical.—*Richerii, Hist. Conc. Gen.* tom. i. c. 7. Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1, &c. *Palmer's Treatise on the Church.*

Pseudo-Council of Ephesus, called Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449.

Although this council was immediately rejected and annulled by the œcumenical council of Chalcedon, and by the universal Church; it is too remarkable to be omitted. The circumstances which led to it are as follows:—

The heretic Eutyches, whom Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, had in the preceding year deposed, burning with the desire of revenge, for some time past had endeavoured, by falsehood and cabals, to induce the emperor Theodosius to call a council, in which he hoped to triumph over the bishops. This hope was greatly strengthened by the knowledge that he possessed the favour of Chrysaphius, the ennuch and chief officer of the emperor, whose influence over the latter was unbounded, and who so entered into the views of Eutyches, as to resolve to obtain the reversal of the sentence against him. He began by persuading Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, to undertake the defence of Eutyches, and to attack Flavianus. Then he united his entreaties to those of Eutyches, that the emperor would convoke an œcumenical council. In consequence, Theodosius wrote to Dioscorus, desiring him to attend at Ephesus, on the 1st of August, with ten metropolitan, and as many Egyptian bishops, and no more, in order to inquire into a question of faith in dispute between Flavianus and Eutyches, and to remove from the Church the favourers of Nestorius. In the same manner he wrote to other bishops, always fixing the same number of metropolitans and bishops, and especially forbidding Theodoret to leave his diocese. He sent his own officers, Elpidus and Eulogius, with authority to provide such troops as they might deem necessary, in order to carry into effect what might be required.

The bishops who had sat in judgment upon Eutyches were present at the council, but were allowed to take no part in the debates, and Dioscorus was allowed to take the lead in every thing relating to the council.

Before its commencement Eutyches obtained leave to hold an assembly, in which he pretended to show that the acts relating to his condemnation had been falsified, and his answer garbled, those expressions which would have established his innocence having been, as he pretended, omitted. However the correctness of the acts was proved.

S. Leo sent three legates in consequence of the letter of the emperor, one of whom died on the road, the other two were Julian, bishop of Puteoli, and the deacon Hilary. It was at this time that he wrote his celebrated letter to Flavianus upon the Incarnation. Ephesus, 449.

The council met on the day appointed, August 8, and about one hundred and thirty bishops attended, amongst them were Dioscorus, Domnus of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalapius of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Eustathius of Berytus, Basil of Ancyra, and Basil of Seleucia; also Flavianus with several of his clergy. Eutyches was present, with many of his monks.

About forty-two of the bishops who had taken part in the council of Constantinople were present, but they were not allowed to have any voice in the deliberations, any more than Flavianus himself, which, as Tillemont observes, was manifestly contrary to the canons.

In the first place Dioscorus, who presided, read the emperor's letter of convocation, after which the pope's legates presented his letter to the council, which, however, was not read. Thalapius then moved that they should proceed at once to consider the question concerning the faith, to which Dioscorus objected, upon a plea that the faith, as settled by the fathers, ought not to be questioned, but that they should rather proceed at once to consider whether the condemnation of Eutyches had been in accordance with that faith. Then Eutyches was brought in, and presented a petition, in which he complained of having been persecuted for his unwillingness to hold any other faith but that of the Nicene creed.

Flavianus then demanded that Eusebius of Dorylœum, who had accused Eutyches, should be brought in and confronted with him; this however was refused, and the acts of the council of Constantinople were then read: In the exposition of faith given by Flavianus they could find nothing to condemn; but when it was read that Basil of Seleucia had said that Jesus Christ is to be adored in two natures, Barsumas and his monks, together with the Egyptian bishops, with loud cries exclaimed, that he deserved to be torn to pieces who thus divided Christ; and when they came to that passage in which Eusebius pressed Eutyches to confess two natures, voices were heard on all sides calling out that Eusebius

Ephesus, 449.

ought to be burnt alive, and that whoever held the two natures in Jesus Christ should be anathematized.

Dioscorus and his party then declared, that they believed with Eutyches in one nature only, upon which Basil of Seleucia, terrified by the threats held out to him, retracted all that he had said upon the two natures at Constantinople, and Seleucus of Amasia had the cowardice to do so also. After this Dioscorus demanded of the bishops their opinion respecting the orthodoxy of Eutyches, to which Juvenal of Jerusalem answering first, declared that he considered him to be perfectly orthodox, and the other bishops not daring to say any thing contrary to the will of Dioscorus, all declared that they concurred in that judgment.

Then Domnus of Antioch consented that Eutyches should be re-established in the priesthood and in his office of abbot, to which all the bishops present agreed.

After this Dioscorus ordered the acts of the sixth session of the council of Ephesus to be read, forbidding, upon pain of deposition and anathema, the use of any other than the Nicene creed; a prohibition plainly intended to check the rashness of individuals in making new creeds, not to prevent the use of any other words than those employed in the creed, in order to express more clearly the sense of any one of its articles. However, Dioscorus, upon the pretence that Flavianus had expressed the doctrine of the Church in more precise terms than the Church herself had done in that creed, insisted that he had subjected himself to the penalties denounced by the canon of Ephesus. The bishops shamefully agreeing with him, sentence of deposition was at once pronounced against Flavianus and Eusebius. Flavianus appealed from this decision to the bishop of Rome, whose legate, Hilary, boldly opposed the sentence; at the same time many of the bishops on their knees implored Dioscorus to reconsider the matter; but he, determined to carry it through, cried out for the imperial officers, upon which the proconsul Proclus entered, followed by a band of soldiers, armed with swords and sticks, and carrying chains, who by threats and blows compelled the bishops to sign the sentence of deposition. This, at last, ninety-six of them did, many, however, being first severely wounded; Flavianus himself was treated with such excessive violence, that he died of the injuries he had received within three days; it is said that Dioscorus

jumped upon him as he lay upon the ground, and that Barsumas and the monks kicked him with the utmost brutality. Ephesus, 449.

To the condemnation of Flavianus that of Eusebius of Dorylœum was added, which ended the first session; after which the legate Hilary, dreading fresh scenes of violence, fled secretly to Rome. In the following sessions Theodoret of Tyre was deposed, also Domnus of Antioch and Ibas of Edessa; after which Dioscorus departed, and the bishops withdrew from Ephesus.

Thus ended the *σύνοδος ληστρικὴ*, as the Greeks justly named this disgraceful assembly, in which violence and injustice were carried on to the utmost excess. —Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1471.

ERFORT. [*Concilium Erpfodiense.*] Held in 932 under Henry I. of Germany, at which thirteen of the bishops of Germany were present, besides abbots and other clerks. Five canons were published. Erfort, 932.

Canon 1. Directs that the festivals of the twelve apostles shall be observed with the greatest reverence.

Canon 2. Forbids to fast on Sundays and other festivals; also declares that the king had granted an injunction, that no judges should cite Christian persons before them during the seven days preceding Christmas, nor from Quinquagesima to the octave of Easter, nor during the seven days preceding the feast of the nativity of S. John the Baptist, so as to prevent them from going to church.

Canon 3. Forbids any judge to interrupt persons *bona fide* going to or from church to pray, or whilst in the church.

Canon 5. Forbids self-imposed fasting without the bishop's consent.

ETAMPES. [*Concilium Etampense.*] Held in 1130. Convoked by Louis le Gros, on occasion of the schism caused by pope Anacletus, in order to ascertain clearly which of the two popes, Innocent II. or Anacletus had been lawfully and truly elected. S. Bernard was called to the council. After some time spent in fasting and prayer, the king, bishops, and lords met together with one accord to listen to and follow the opinion of S. Bernard upon the subject, who, after giving it the most profound attention, and making the most exact inquiries concerning the form of election, the qualifications of the electors, and the fitness and reputation of Innocent II., Etampes, 1130.

who had been *first* elected, gave it as his opinion, that he had been lawfully chosen, and ought to be recognized as pope. This opinion was gladly received by the whole assembly.—*Sug. vita Ludw.* p. 317. Tom. x. Conc. p. 972.

Etampes, 1147. ETAMPES. Held on Septuagesima Sunday, 1147, under king Louis VII., in which the crusade to Jerusalem was resolved upon. On Easter Sunday the king received from the hands of pope Eugenius III. at S. Denys the royal standard.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1104.

Exeter, 926. EXETER. [*Concilium Exoniense.*] Held at Christmas, somewhere about the year 926[1], by king Ethelstan. Complaint was made that the laws enacted in the council of Greatlea were not obeyed, and an unanimous resolution passed to drive the transgressors out of England. It was also enacted that "all the servants of God in every minster should sing fifty psalms to God for the king every Friday."—*Johnson, Eccl. Canons. Inett, Orig. Ang.* vol. i. p. 304.

Exeter, 1287. EXETER. Held April 16, 1287, by Peter Quivil, the bishop. A book of constitutions in fifty-five articles was drawn up, relating to the sacraments and other matters.

The first eight relate to the seven sacraments.

9 and 10. Of churches, chapels, oratories and churchyards.

11. Of the ornaments, &c. of churches, and orders that there be in every church at least *one* chalice of silver or of silver-gilt, two corporals, two vestments, one for festivals and the other for ordinary occasions, four "tuellœ" for the high altar, two of which at least shall be consecrated.

Also for every altar where mass is to be celebrated there shall be two surplices and one rochet, a Lenten veil and a nuptial veil, a pall for funerals; a frontal for each altar, a missal, gradual, "torparium," manual, &c. &c., a chest for the books and vestments, a pyx of silver, or at worst of ivory, with a lock, a Chrismatory of pewter, with a lock, a pax, three vials, stone sacramentarium, immoveable, chasuble, vase for holy water, paschal candelabrum, two crosses, an image of the Blessed Virgin, &c. &c.

[1] There is some uncertainty about the date, since Wilkins assigns 928 as that of the council of Grateley, and does not notice this of Exeter.

The parish to provide all these things, with certain exceptions, which are specified. "Also we have heard that parishioners often quarrel concerning the seats in church, two or more of them claiming the same seat, whence great scandal arises, and divine service is often hindered; we therefore enact that no person in future shall be allowed to claim any seat as his own, the nobility and patrons of churches being alone excepted, but he who first comes to church to pray shall choose his own place for prayer." Exeter, 1287.

13. Forbids markets, &c. in churches and churchyards.

14. Of cemeteries.

15. Of the immunities of the Church.

16. Of the repairs of churches.

17. Of the life and conversation of the clergy.

18. Of concubinary clerks.

19. Of residence.

20. Of inquiry to be made into the capacity of ecclesiastical persons.

21. Of the duty of ministers to say the office every night and day.

22. Of the duty of parishioners to attend church on Sundays and festivals.

23. Contains a list of festivals to be observed in each month.

24. Forbids the clergy to practise any business.

25. Forbids to let out churches to farmers.

26. Forbids to alienate church property.

27. Forbids clerks to build for themselves upon ground not belonging to the Church, with Church property.

28. Orders five marks as the proper stipend of a curate.

29. Orders that "*Beneficia aquæ benedictæ*," be assigned only to scholars.

30. Forbids a clerk to cite another before the secular judge.

31. Of the celebration of rural chapters.

32. Forbids to summon innocent persons before the chapter.

35. Of the seizure of excommunicated persons by the secular arm.

36. Forbids to confer a parish on a priest for one year after ordination.

37. Of the ordination of priests.
38. Forbids to take any fee for ordinations.
39. Forbids to allow divine service to be hindered on account of the faults of the priest.
40. Of visitations.
41. Forbids clerks to bind themselves to submit to secular judgment.
42. Of the form of liberating the property of clerks detained by laymen.
43. Of care to be observed in promulgating sentences of excommunication.
44. No one to excommunicate another in his own cause.
45. Of matrimonial causes.
46. Of appeals.
47. Of quæstors.
48. Of relics.
49. Of Jews.
50. Of wills.
51. Permits rectors, after Quadragesima, to will away the income of their Churches during the coming year.
52. Of mortuaries.
53. Of tythes.
54. Of oblations.
55. Of sentences of excommunication.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1263. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 129.

F.

Ferrara, 1438, falselystyled œcumenical.

FERRARA. [*Concilium Ferrariense.*] Eugene VI. having published a bull for the transfer of the council of Basle to Ferrara, a few bishops and abbots assembled on the 8th of January, 1438, viz. cardinal Julian, who presided, five archbishops, eighteen bishops, ten abbots, and some generals of the monastic orders; of these bishops only four had left the council of Basle, which continued its sitting, justly regarding the pope's bull as illegal.

Session I. Feb. 10,

On the 10th of January the first sitting was held, in which the translation of the council from Basle was pronounced to be canonical, and therefore the œcumenical council of Ferrara lawfully assembled.

Session II. March 15.

Pope Eugene presided in the second session, at the head of seventy-two bishops, and promulgated a decree against the fathers at Basle. Whilst these matters were

being transacted, the Greek emperor, John Manuel Paleologus, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II., arrived, on the 9th of February, at Venice, and were received with great pomp, together with Mark, archbishop of Ephesus; twenty-one other prelates (amongst whom was Isidore, a Russian bishop, and Bessarion of Nicea), and other ecclesiastics, amounting in all to seven hundred persons. Ferrara, 1438.

Before holding the first session with the Greeks, a scheme was drawn up of the different questions to be debated:

1. The procession of the Holy Spirit.
2. The addition "*Filioque*" to the creed.
3. Purgatory and the intermediate state.
4. The use of unleavened bread in the holy eucharist.
5. The authority of the Roman see and the primacy of the pope.

In the first meeting, where the Greeks were present, it was publicly proclaimed that the œcumenical council was then sitting at Ferrara, and four months were allowed for those who had been called to it to come. However, neither the invitations nor the style of œcumenical, which Eugene gave to his council, nor the four months' delay, had much influence, seeing that no one else arrived at the council; that of Basle in the meanwhile continued its sitting, attended by the ambassadors of the emperor and other princes, especially those of France and Spain. Charles VII., indeed, forbad any of his subjects to attend the council of Ferrara.

At last the first session of Greeks and Latins was held, and the opinion of the Latin Church upon the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit debated. Session I. with the Greeks, Oct. 8.

The second session was entirely occupied by a long discourse of the bishop of Rhodes upon the advantages of peace, which seems to have caused the decision of the council, forbidding any speeches in their future deliberations. Session II. Oct. 11.

In the third session Andrew, Latin bishop of Rhodes, speaking on behalf of the Latins, besought the Greeks, if perchance a seemingly hard word should fall from them in the heat of discussion, to attribute it rather to the matter in dispute than to any personal feeling. The fourth session was consumed in desultory discourse between Mark of Ephesus and Andrew of Rhodes. Sessions III and IV. Oct. 14, 15.

In the fifth session, the faith, as settled by the fathers Session V. Oct. 15.

Ferrara, 1438. at Nicea, was set forth, and their creed read; then the definitions of faith made at Chalcedon, and the first and second œcumenical councils of Constantinople; after which the Latins produced a manuscript, which they declared to be very ancient, of the second council of Nicea, asserting that in it would be found stated the procession of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father, but from the Son also.

Session VI. Oct. 20. Andrew of Rhodes endeavoured in the sixth session, in a long discourse, to show that what the Greeks persisted in regarding as an *addition*, was in reality neither an addition nor an alteration, but simply an explication of the original meaning of the creed, and a necessary consequence from it; in proof of this he brought forward various quotations from the Greek fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom, who says that the Son possesseth all that the Father hath, except the paternity, according to S. John xvi.

Session VII. Oct. 25. In the seventh session he continued his discourse upon the same subject, and replied to the authorities alleged by Mark of Ephesus, explaining how, when the Church forbids the giving any other than the Nicene Creed to converts to Christianity, she does not intend but that that creed may be expounded to them, and taught them more clearly in other words; and he showed that the second œcumenical council at Constantinople had, in fact, enlarged the creed of Nicea, in order to express more clearly certain Christian verities, in opposition to the heretics who contravened them.

Sessions VIII. & IX. Nov. 1, 4. In the two following sessions Bessarion of Nicea spoke on the Greek side of the question, and insisted, that although it was no where forbidden to explain the creed, it was, nevertheless, forbidden by the third œcumenical council (that of Ephesus) to insert those explanations in the creed, however true they might be.

Session X. Nov. 8. In the tenth session John, bishop of Forti, spoke in answer to the observation of Bessarion concerning the prohibition made in the third œcumenical council, declaring that the real question to be considered was, whether or not the dogma of the Latins upon the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit was true; for that, if true, it was lawful to insert it in the creed, to meet the attacks of those who denied that truth. He maintained that no law could deprive the Church of the power of adding to the creed, when she should see fit

to do so ; and that the law of Ephesus applied only to the case of private persons, who presumed to make additions without authority. Ferrara, 1438.

In the following session cardinal Julian spoke upon the subject, and said that it was the false creed of the Nestorians which had given rise to the prohibition in question ; that the council had forbidden not only every addition to the creed, but also every new exposition of the faith [3] ; and that, consequently, if this rule were to be applied to the Church, it would follow that the Church herself could not thenceforth frame any new exposition of the faith. Session XI. Nov. 11.

The debate upon the subject was continued through the four following sessions. The Latins persisting in their demand, that the question should be examined to the very foundation ; and that if it appeared evidently that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the person of the Son as well as from that of the Father, the addition of the word *Filioque* to the creed should be allowed to stand ; but on the contrary, if that doctrine should prove to be unfounded, they declared their willingness that the words should be expunged. The Greeks, however, obstinately insisted that the words should be first expunged before any further steps were taken, and thus the contending parties came to no conclusion. Sessions XII. to XV. inclusive, from Nov. 15 to Dec. 8.

In the following session it was proposed to transfer the council from Ferrara to Florence, and this being agreed to, publication was made of the change.—Tom. xiii. Conc. pp. 1—222. 825—1031. Session XVI. March 5, 1439.

FIMES. [*Concilium apud S. Macram.*] Held in the church of S. Macra, April 2, 881, by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in which eight articles were published. The most important of these is the fourth, which orders that all monasteries, nunneries, and other religious houses shall be visited by the bishop, and by the king's commissioners, and a report drawn up of their state.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 337. Fimes, 881.

FINCHALL. [*Concilium Finchalense.*] Held about [1] Finchall, 799, in the diocese of Durham.

[3] And not so only ; the holy synod not only forbad any one to publish or write, "sed etiam ne aliud sentire præter fidem Nicææ expositam ;" whence, adds the cardinal, if I ask you whether you think that God is eternal, and you answer in the affirmative, according to your line of argument any one might say that you had incurred anathema, because that is not contained in the Creed, and therefore you ought not to think it.

799, by Eambald, archbishop of York, for the restoration of discipline. Five œcumenical councils were acknowledged, and the proper time for the celebration of Easter laid down.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1148.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 161.

Fleury, 1107. FLEURY. [*Conventus Floriacensis.*] Held in 1107, in which the body of S. Benedict was taken up in the presence of king Louis, and placed under the altar erected to his honour.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 753.

Florence, 1055. FLORENCE. [*Concilium Florentinum.*] Held about Whitsuntide, A. D. 1055, by Victor II. in the presence of the emperor, Henry III., against the errors of Berenger, and the alienation of Church property.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1079.

Florence, 1106. FLORENCE. Held in 1106, by Paschal II., against the errors of the bishop of Florence, who maintained that Antichrist was born. The council came to no conclusion, owing to the tumult made by the people, who flocked to Florence, attracted by the dispute.—*Mansi, Supp. to Labbe,* Tom. ii. col. 221, 222.

Florence, 1439, falsely styled œcumenical. FLORENCE. Held in 1439. This council was nothing more than a continuation of that assembled by pope Eugene at Ferrara[4], which, owing to the plague having broken out at the latter place, he transferred to Florence. The pope himself was present, with John Paleologus, the Greek emperor, Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, and many Greek prelates.

Session I. Feb. 26. In the first session the patriarch of Constantinople being ill was unable to attend, and the discussion was chiefly carried on between the emperor, who is reported to have been a man of learning and ability, and cardinal Julian. The conclusion arrived at was, that both parties should strive to facilitate a re-union, and that the Greeks should in private discuss the question how the union could be best effected, and report their opinion in the next session; nothing, however, could be thus arranged, and they subsequently returned to their public discussion.

Sessions II. and III. March 2, 5. The question concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit was continued. John, the provincial of the Dominicans in Lombardy, proved from Scripture and tradition, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the

[4] See C. Ferrara.

Father and the Son. He explained what is meant by the word "procession;" and said, that to "proceed," meant to receive existence from. To this Mark of Ephesus agreed. And John proceeding with his argument, said, that from whichever of the persons in the blessed Trinity the Holy Spirit received existence, from that same person he proceeded; but He received existence from the Son, therefore He *proceeded* from the Son, in the proper acceptation of the term. To this Mark answered, by denying that the Holy Spirit received existence from the Son; and John then proceeded to adduce proofs to that effect. Florence. 1439.

In the following session John continued his argument, adducing a passage from the third book of S. Basil against Eunomius, to prove that this holy doctor had taught in distinct terms the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father. John had brought with him from Constantinople several copies of the works of S. Basil. Session IV. March 7.

The passage adduced from S. Basil, was discussed in the three following sessions. Sessions V. VI. VII. March 10. 14, 17.

In the eighth and ninth sessions Mark of Ephesus absented himself, but John continued to speak, and endeavoured to show that of all the Greek fathers who have spoken upon the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit, many have said, either in direct or in equivalent terms, that He proceedeth from the Father and the Son; and that those who state that He proceedeth from the Father, have never so spoken as to *exclude* the Son. After some further discourse, he handed in an analysis of his speech. Sessions VIII. IX. March 21, 25.

After this no other session was held before the departure of the Greeks, who were much divided upon the subject of the addition to the creed. Several meetings were held amongst themselves; at one of which, held at the residence of their patriarch, they were plainly told that they must arrange some means of union between the two Churches upon this subject, or find their own way back to their country as best they could. One of them declared that he would never be guilty of betraying the faith of his Church, for the sake of being sent home again at the expense of the pope; adding, "Mori malo, quam unquam latinizare." Many, however, amongst whom were the emperor and Bessarion, were for union; others, headed by

Florence, 1439.

Mark of Ephesus, were opposed to it. The discussion was again opened, the discourse of John was examined, and Mark of Ephesus charged it with heresy. Bessarion defended it, loudly declaring that they should give glory to God, and confess the Latin doctrine to be true, and agreeable to that of the old fathers of the Greek Church. Subsequently, in a long discourse in defence of the Latin doctrine, he urged his brethren to union; in which he was seconded by George Scholarius, a Greek theologian. As there seemed little chance of any decision being come to, the emperor and the pope, in concert, proposed that a certain number of persons should be named on both sides, who might deliberate upon the best means of effecting the union of the Churches. After many unsuccessful endeavours, they drew up a profession of faith upon the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit, in which they declared as follows:—"That the Holy Spirit is from all eternity from the Father and of the Son; that He from all eternity proceedeth from both, as from one only principle, and by one only *spiration;* that by this way of speaking, it is signified that the Son also is, as the Greeks express it, the *cause*, or, as the Latins, the *principle* of the subsistence of the Holy Spirit equally with the Father. Also we declare, that what some of the holy fathers have said of the procession of the Holy Spirit *from* (ex) the Father *by* (per) the Son, is to be taken in such a sense as, that the Son is as well as the Father, and conjointly with Him, the cause or principle of the Holy Spirit; and since all that the Father hath He hath, in begetting Him, communicated to his only begotten Son, the paternity alone excepted; so it is from the Father from all eternity that the Son hath received this also, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father."

In the same decree the council declared that it was lawful to consecrate unleavened bread as well as that which had been leavened; and upon the subject of purgatory, that the souls of those who die truly penitent in the love of God, before bringing forth fruit meet for repentance, are purified after death by the pains of purgatory, and that they derive comfort in those pains from the prayers of the faithful on earth, as also by the sacrifice of the mass, alms, and other works of piety.

Concerning the primacy of the pope, they confessed

the pope to be the sovereign pontiff and vicar of Jesus Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians, and the governor of the Church of God, according to the sacred canons and acts of the œcumenical councils, *saving the privileges and rights of the eastern patriarchs.* Florence, 1439.

After various conferences, the decree of union was drawn up in due order, in Greek and in Latin; it was then read and signed by the pope, and by eighteen cardinals, by the Latin patriarchs of Jerusalem and Grenada, and the two episcopal ambassadors of the duke of Burgundy, eight archbishops, forty-seven bishops, (who were almost all Italians,) four generals of monastic orders, and forty-one abbots. On the Greek side, it was signed by the emperor John Paleologus, by the vicars of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, (the patriarch of Constantinople had lately died,) and by several metropolitans. This decree was published on the 6th of July, 1439, after which the Greeks, to the number of thirty, left Florence, and arrived at Constantinople, February 1, 1440.

After their departure, the council continued its sittings; and in the next session, held September 4th, the fathers at Basle were declared to be heretics and schismatics. In the second, November 22nd, a very long decree was made upon the subject of the union of the Armenians with the Roman Church. This decree runs in the name of the pope only. Besides the true faith concerning the blessed Trinity and the incarnation, as set forth by the councils pointed out in it, it contains the form and matter of each sacrament set forth in a manner different from that to which the Greeks were accustomed. In the third, March 23rd, 1440, the anti-pope Amadeus, whom the fathers at Basle had elected, was declared to be a heretic and schismatic, and all his followers guilty of high treason; a promise of pardon being held out to those who should submit within fifty days. In the fourth session, 4th of February, 1441, a decree for the re-union of the Jacobites of Ethiopia with the Roman Church was published, signed by the pope and eight cardinals. Andrew, the deputy of John XI., the patriarch of Alexandria, received it in the name of the Ethiopian Jacobites. In the fifth session, 26th of April, 1442, the pope's proposal to transfer the council to Rome was agreed to; but only

two sessions were held there, in which decrees were drawn up concerning the proposed union of the Syrians, Chaldeans, and Maronites with the Church of Rome.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 223 and 1034.

Florence, 1573.

FLORENCE. Held in 1573, for the execution of the decrees of the council of Trent.

Four sessions were held, in which sixty-three articles were published, most of which contain several chapters.

Art. 1. After reciting the Nicene creed, decrees that no interpretation of Holy Scripture be received, unless confirmed by the tradition of the Church; it also recognises seven sacraments; receives the doctrine of Trent upon original sin and justification; maintains the doctrine of transubstantiation and the offering of Jesus Christ, both for the living and the dead; also the sufficiency of the holy sacrament under one kind, the reality of purgatory, and the utility of prayer for the dead; approves of the worship of saints, and of honours paid to the images of Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and other saints; also it asserts the utility of indulgences, and the power of the Church in that respect; the primacy of the Church of Rome, as well as that of him who presides over it; in short, it approves of all the acts of the council of Trent, and rejects every thing which is contrary to them; requiring them to be sincerely believed and held by all who shall be admitted to any office in the Church.

2. Treats of the permission necessary for reading forbidden books, and the punishment of those who read them without permission.

3. Treats of the manner in which relics are to be preserved; forbids the least appearance of cupidity in showing them to the faithful.

4. Treats of the respect due to images; desires that none be set up without the bishop's sanction; directs that they shall never be exposed in indecent situations.

5. Forbids every sort of scenic representation, even of sacred subjects, by the clergy, without the bishop's written permission.

6. Treats of the publication of miracles.

7. Treats of the punishment due to those who consult conjurors, &c., and to the clergy who practise exorcism without permission.

8. Enjoins that Jews shall abstain from business on festival days, and keep themselves at home during the

three days preceding Easter; it likewise forbids all familiar intercourse between Jews and Christians. Florence, 1573.

9. Forbids lay persons to argue with heretics, and requires bishops to use every precaution to drive away suspected persons from their flock.

11. Treats of the celebration of festivals.

12. Treats of the respect due to churches.

13. Treats of the immunities of churches.

14. Treats of the repair of churches, and the union of two or more.

15. Treats of the government of a cathedral church, when vacant.

16. Treats of the enquiries, &c., to be made concerning any one about to be elevated to the episcopate.

17. Treats of the duties of canons.

18. Treats of the due celebration of mass.

19. Relates to preachers.

20. Treats of the charge of the theologist [one of the canons in a chapter, whose duty it is to teach theology, and preach occasionally].

21. Treats of catechisms.

22. Of seminaries.

23, 24, 25, 26. Of collations to benefices; of the election to cures of souls; of pluralities, and residence.

27. Episcopal visitations.

28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. The administration of the sacraments.

36 and 37. Treat of the conduct, &c., of bishops and clergy.

38. Of the punishment of adulterers.

39. Of the punishment of usurers.

41, 42, 43. Of simony, fasting, and tithes.

45. Of indulgences.

46. Of processions.

47. Of funerals.

48. Of burials.

49. Of the care to be taken of infants by nurses.

51. Of fraternities.

52. Contains various regulations for nunneries.

53. Requires medical men to warn sick persons to attend to their spiritual affairs, and that not later than the third visit.

54. Treats of the duties of notaries.

55, 56, 57. Relate to proceedings in the case of ecclesiastics.

58. Recommends great caution in the fulmination of censures.

59, 60, 61, 62. Relate to the right use of them.

These acts are subscribed by Antonio Altovita, metropolitan and president, by four bishops, and the procurators of two bishops absent.—*Mansi*, Tom. v. p. 915.

France, 1002. FRANCE. Several councils were held in the year 1002, in different parts of France; it was declared, first, that the practice of fasting from Ascension-day to Whit-sunday, as practised by many of the faithful, was a thing indifferent; secondly, that the monks should continue to observe their custom of chanting "Te Deum" on the three (or four) Sundays preceding Christmas and during Lent, contrary to the Roman custom; thirdly, that the festival of the annunciation should be celebrated on the 25th of March.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 782.

Francfort, 794. FRANCFORT. [*Concilium Francofordiense.*] Held at Francfort on the Maine, about the month of June, 794; composed of the bishops of Germany, Gaul, and Aquitaine. Bishops also attended from Spain, Italy, and England, and two delegates from pope Hadrian. The whole number amounted to upwards of three hundred.

The heresy of Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, bishop of Urgel, was condemned, and fifty-six canons were published, the second of which is the memorable canon which condemns the worship of images, as decreed by the second council of Nicea, in 787. It appears that after the termination of the council of Nicea, the pope forwarded an authentic copy of the acts of the council to France, to be approved by the Gallican bishop, which, however, they entirely refused to do, and declared, "Dum nos nihil in imaginibus spernamus præter adorationem . . . . non ad adorandum, sed ad memoriam rerum gestarum et venustatem parietum habere permittimus." *Lib. Car.* l. iii. c. 16[5]. The

[5] "*Libri Carolini*:" Four books so called, composed under the name and by order of Charlemagne, in refutation of the acts of the second council of Nicea. Some have attributed them to Angilran, bishop of Metz, others to Alcuin. Nothing can be stronger than the opposition which they offer to every act of or appearance of worship as paid to images; even to bowing the head and burning lights before them. Romanists pretend that the Gallican bishops, as well as the author of these books, were deceived by a false translation of the acts of the second council of Nicea, which,

pope composed a reply to their view of the matter; but their opinion remained unshaken; and in 792, Charlemagne transmitted to England an authentic copy of the acts of Nicea, which he had received from Constantinople, for the opinion of the English bishops, who sent deputies to attend this council, to testify to their opposition to the acts of Nicea. Francfort, 794.

Canon 1. Condemns Felix and Elipandus.

2. Condemns the second council of Nicea, and all worship of images[6].

6. Orders that bishops shall see justice done to the clergy of their diocese; if the clergy are not satisfied with their judgment, they may appeal to the metropolitan in synod.

7. Forbids bishops to live out of their dioceses, and priests to leave their benefices.

11. Orders all monks to abstain from business and all secular employments.

15. Orders that in monasteries containing the remains of departed saints, a chapel be built, in which the holy office shall be said both by day and night.

16. Forbids to take money for the ordination of monks.

they say, led them to fancy that the council had inculcated the paying divine honour and worship to images, and that it was this false notion which induced them to condemn the council; but this is evidently untrue, since it is an historical fact, that authentic copies of the acts of the council were sent into France by the pope; as also, that Charlemagne received another copy direct from Constantinople.—*Palmer's Treatise on the Church of Christ*, part iv. chap. x. sect. 4.

Roger Hoveden has the following:—"In the year 792, Charles, king of the Franks, sent into Britain" [to Offa, king of the Mercians] "a synodal book, sent to him from Constantinople, in which, alas! were found many things inconvenient, and *contrary to the true faith;* especially in this, that it was established by unanimous consent of almost all the doctors and bishops of the East, no less than three hundred, that images ought to be worshipped" [imagines adorari debere], "which the Church of God doth altogether abominate" [execratur]. "Against which Albinus" [Alcuinus] "wrote an epistle, fortified with the authority of the holy Scriptures." Matthew of Westminster, upon the year 792, has the same.

[6] "Allata est in medium quæstio de nova Grecorum Synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in qua scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut deificæ Trinitati, servitium aut adorationem non impenderent, anathema judicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi patres nostri omnimodis adorationem et servitutem renuentes contempserunt atque consentientes condemnaverunt."

17. Directs that no abbot be elected without the consent of the bishop of the diocese.

18. Forbids the mutilation of a monk for neglect of his rule.

19. Forbids the clergy and monks to frequent taverns to drink.

21. Orders that the observance of Sunday shall commence at vespers on the preceding day.

30. Constitutes the bishop, conjointly with the magistrates of the place, judge in every cause between a layman and ecclesiastic.

38. Forbids the clergy of the king's chapel to communicate with those of the clergy who have quarrelled with their bishop.

41. Forbids bishops to leave their dioceses for a longer space than three weeks.

47. Charges the bishop to overlook the conduct of abbesses, and to report any ill-behaviour to the king, that they may be deposed.

48. Orders the bishops to distribute the oblations made in the churches,—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1013.

Freisinghen, 144 0.

FREISINGHEN. [*Concilium Frisingense.*] Held at Freisinghen, in the archbishopric of Saltzburg, in 1440, by Nicodemus de Scala, bishop of the place. Twenty-six regulations were published.

5. Renews the decree of Basle against the concubinage of the clergy.

10. Deprives of Christian burial persons killed at tournaments and spectacles; also those who die suddenly, not having made confession during the previous year.

16. Forbids to say mass without lights, and to elevate the host before consecration, lest the people thereby be led to commit idolatry.

25. Forbids to excommunicate either layman or clerk without a previous canonical monition.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1283.

Friuli (Citta da), 796 (or 791, *Labbe*).

FRIULI, (Citta da). [*Concilium Forojuliense.*] Held in 796, by Paulinus, or Paulus, patriarch of Aquileia, and his suffragans. The errors of those who maintained that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father only, and of those who declared that the Son of God made man, was only the *adopted* Son of God, were condemned.

A definition of faith was published, and fourteen

canons were made. 1. Condemns simony. The others relate to the lives and conversation of the clergy, marriage, &c. Canon 13 relates to the proper observance of Sunday; bids all Christians to commence the observance of it from vespers on Saturday, by abstaining from all evil, and every carnal work, and by giving themselves to prayer, and going to Church.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 991.

G.

GANGRA. [*Concilium Gangrense.*] Held sometime between the years 325 and 380. Dom Cellier[7] would assign it to a year subsequent to 379, in which S. Basil died, because that father, who in various places speaks of the excesses of Eustathius of Sebaste, says nothing at all about his having been condemned in this council; whence Cellier infers that it was not holden till after his death. And further, it appears that Peter, the brother of S. Basil, occupied the see of Sebaste, in Armenia, in 380, from which he thinks that he was elected in the place of Eustathius, deposed in this council, about the end of the year 380. Gangra, between 325 and 380.

But it is necessary to prove that the Eustathius condemned in this council was the same with Eustathius of Sebaste of whom Basil speaks. Socrates and Sozomen, the most ancient ecclesiastical historians, plainly assert that it was so; and, moreover, what they say of Eustathius and his doctrine agrees exactly with what we read in the synodal letter of Gangra. The letter does not, indeed, distinctly term him bishop of Sebaste, but it indirectly accuses him of having spread his errors in Armenia, since it is addressed to the bishops of that country. Added to the testimony of Socrates and Sozo-

[7] "Basilius, in Ep. 74, quam scripsit ad occidentales contra Eustathium Sebastanum, Gangrensis Concilii nullam mentionem facit. Ex quo manifeste colligitur, tunc cum Basilius eam Epistolam conscriberet, scripsit autem sub Valente, nondum celebratum fuisse Gangrense Concilium."—*Valesius ad Soc.* lib. ii. cap. 43.

Valens reigned from 364 to 378. If, however, as Pagi asserts, Hosius of Cordova was present in the council, so late a date as A.D. 380 cannot be assigned to it. Hosius died in 357; but there is sufficient reason to doubt his presence. See note, Baron. tom. iv. A.D. 319, p. 3. About 324 is the date given by Labbe and Cossart, Collection of Councils. Not later than 340, according to Johnson, Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. ii. p. 76.

Gangra, between 325 and 380.

men, we have that of S. Basil, who relates that the disciples of Eustathius of Sebaste rendered an ascetic life odious by their hypocrisy, and false piety. This agrees with the idea which the canons of Gangra give us of the conduct of Eustathius and his followers therein condemned. There can, then, be little doubt that the Eustathius of the council is identical with Eustathius of Sebaste. And if this be so, the most probable date of the council of Gangra is perhaps just before, if not after, the death of S. Basil, i. e. about 379.

This Eustathius, towards the end of his life, originated the notion that it is unlawful to marry, and to eat certain meats. He separated several married persons; advised those who disliked the public offices of the Church to communicate at home. Himself wore, and made his followers also wear, an extraordinary dress. Obliged women to cut off their hair; said that it was quite unnecessary to keep the prescribed fasts of the Church, and ordered his followers, on the contrary, to fast on Sundays. And maintained that they should avoid, as the greatest profanation, the communion and the benediction of a married priest living with his wife.

In order to arrest the course of these dangerous errors, an assembly of bishops was held at Gangra, the metropolis of Paphlagonia, in which twenty-one canons were published, in opposition to the error of Eustathius and his followers. Fifteen bishops subscribed them, and addressed them, together with a synodal letter, containing briefly the causes which led to the assembling of the council, to the bishops of Armenia.

1. Condemns with anathema those who blame marriage, and who say that a woman living with her husband, cannot be saved.

2. Condemns with anathema those who forbid the eating of meat, even when the directions given by the apostolic council at Jerusalem are complied with.

3. Anathematizes those who teach that slaves may quit their masters, and forsake their servitude, under pretence of religion.

4. Anathematizes those who separate themselves from the communion of a married priest, and refuse to partake of the holy communion consecrated by him.

5. Anathematizes those who despise the house of God, and the assemblies of the saints therein held.

Gangra, between 325 and 380.

6. Anathematizes those who hold private conventicles, and perform there ecclesiastical functions without the presence of a priest or the consent of the bishop.

7. Anathematizes those who appropriate the offerings made to the Church to their own use.

8. Anathematizes those who dispose of the oblations without the bishop's consent, or the consent of those to whom he has given the charge [8].

9. Anathematizes those who embrace the state of virginity or continence, not for the sake of perfection, but from a horror of the married state.

10. Anathematizes those who, having themselves embraced the state of virginity, insult married persons.

11. Anathematizes those who despise the agapæ or love-feasts, and refuse to participate in them.

12. Anathematizes those who, under pretence of extraordinary strictness, wear a peculiar dress, and condemn those who wear ordinary clothing.

13. Anathematizes women who under the same pretence of religion [9] wear men's clothes.

14. Anathematizes those who forsake their husbands through a false horror of marriage.

15. Anathematizes those who, under pretext of leading an ascetic life, forsake their children, without providing for their sustenance or conversion.

16. Anathematizes children who, upon the same plea, desert their parents.

17. Anathematizes women who, from a like motive, cut off the hair, which God has given to them as a memorial of the obedience which they owe to their husbands.

18. Anathematizes those who make the Sunday a fast-day.

19. Anathematizes those who despise the fasts received in the Church by tradition.

20. Anathematizes those who speak against the memory of martyrs, or the assemblies held, or offices celebrated, in their honour.

21 is drawn up in these terms:—We have ordered

[8] This and the preceding canon appear to be almost identical. Johnson conjectures that the former may refer to what was given for the maintenance of the clergy, while the other may apply to what was given for the poor.

[9] See the explanation of this in Johnson's Clergyman's Vade Mecum, vol. ii. p. 79.

these things, not to cut off from the Church those who wish to live in the exercise of such acts of piety as the holy Scriptures direct; but those persons who make such exercises the occasion of exalting themselves with arrogance over others who lead a more simple life, and of introducing novelties contrary to Scripture and the canons. We admire the state of virginity; we approve of continence, and of separation from the world; if only these states of life be accompanied by humility and modesty; but we also honour marriage. And we do not despise wealth, if united to justice and liberality. We approve of simplicity of apparel, suited to the wants of the body; we honour the houses of God, and the assemblies held in them, without, at the same time, meaning altogether to shut up piety within their walls; we also commend the great liberality which the brethren extend to the poor, through the medium of the ministry of the Church. In short, we wish that all men should put in practice all that is taught us in holy Scripture and in the apostolical traditions.

These canons were received by the whole Church, and are contained in the codes both of the Greek and Latin Churches.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 413.

Gaul, 429. GAUL. [*Concilium Gallicanum.*] A council, very numerously attended, was held in the autumn of the year 429, in Gaul (probably at Troyes in Champagne), against the errors of Pelagius; and in consequence of the prayer of the bishops of the British Church, that some one should be sent them capable of combating these errors, S. Germanus of Auxerre and S. Lupus of Troyes were, by the unanimous consent of the assembly, commissioned to proceed to England to support the true faith there.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1686.

Gaul, 451. GAUL. Held somewhere in Gaul, probably at Arles, in the year 451. Forty-four bishops, composing the council, signified their assent to the celebrated letter of pope Leo to Flavianus; and sent to him a synodal letter upon the subject, highly eulogistic. See C. Constantinople, A. D. 950.

Gaul, 1041. GAUL. In the year 1041, many councils were held in various parts of the country, for the establishment of the "Trève de Dieu[1];" which ordered that from Wednesday evening to Monday morning, no person should

[1] See note, C. Elne.

take anything by force, or take vengeance for any injury, or a pledge from a surety. Whoever broke this truce, was sentenced to pay the legal compensation (in money) for a capital crime, or to be excommunicated and banished.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 940.

GENTILLY. [*Concilium Gentiliacense.*] Held on Christmas-day, A. D. 767. Six legates from Rome, six ambassadors from the emperor Constantine Copronymus, several Greek bishops, and most of the bishops of Gaul and Germany, were present, together with king Pepin and many of his nobles. The question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was discussed, the Greeks accusing the Latins of having added the words "filioque" to the creed of Constantinople: the question about images was also debated, but the decision of the council is not known.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1703. Gentilly, 767.

GERMANY. [*Concilium Germanicum.*] Held somewhere in Germany in the year 742; the place is unknown (perhaps Ratisbonne). This council was assembled by order of Carloman, April 21st, who in the act of convocation states, that by and with the advice of God's servants and the peers of his court, he had summoned the bishops of the kingdom with their priests to learn from them how the laws of God might best be enforced, and the discipline of the Church, which had grievously fallen into decay, be restored. Six bishops were present, viz. those of Cologne, Augsburg, Wirtemburg, Utrecht, Strasburg, and Eichstat. Seven canons were published, relating chiefly to the conduct of the clergy, and enforcing the canons. Boniface, who presided, wrote to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, an account of all that passed in the council.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1533 and 1565. *Baronius in Ann.* Germany, 742.

GERONA. [*Concilium Gerundense.*] Held in 517, during the reign of Theodoric, John, bishop of Tarragona, presiding, at the head of six bishops of that province. John had previously written to pope Hormisdas, requesting him to address the bishops of Spain upon the subject of discipline, which was greatly neglected amongst them. This he did in a letter, in which he urges them to observe the canons, and to hold councils at least once a year. In this council ten canons were published. Gerona, 517.

1. Directs that the order of celebrating mass and the

holy office observed in the metropolitan church shall be adhered to strictly throughout the province.

2. Orders two Litany seasons to be observed annually, with abstinence from meat and wine; viz. one in the week after Whit-Sunday, and the second beginning on the first Thursday in November, each to consist of three days.

4. Confines the administration of holy baptism to the seasons of Easter and Whitsuntide, except in cases of illness.

5. Allows the baptism of infants on the day of their birth, if they be in danger.

7. Forbids any women to live in the same house with a clergyman, except his mother and sister.

10. Enjoins all bishops and priests to say the Lord's Prayer daily after matins and vespers.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1567.

Gerona, 1068. GERONA. Held in 1068, by the Roman legate cardinal Hugo the White, who in it confirmed, by the pope's authority, the "Trève de Dieu," under pain of excommunication to all who should infringe it. Fourteen canons were published, chiefly directed against the abuses of the times. Eight bishops and two archbishops subscribed the acts.

Gerona, 1261. GERONA. In a council held in the year 1261, several regulations relating to the conduct of the clergy were drawn up, recommending to them care and attention in the performance of the holy offices; forbidding them to exercise the functions of their holy office without first exhibiting their letters of orders; forbidding bishops to receive clergymen from another diocese without testimonials from the bishop of that diocese; forbidding all games of chance, &c. &c. &c.

Gerona, 1274. GERONA. In another council, held in 1274, several regulations were published; amongst others it is forbidden to laymen to bury any corpse in a churchyard, under pain of excommunication. The decrees of the council of Lerida were received, and their strict observance enjoined. It was ordered that no beneficed clergyman should be ignorant of Latin. All clergymen convicted of living in a state of concubinage were ordered to be suspended. The dress, tonsure, conversation, amusements, and everything relating to the outward life of the clergy, was regulated; they were also

forbidden to take any part in judgments involving the death of the party accused, &c. &c. &c.

These two last councils were taken by Mansi from a MS. in the library of M. Colbert; he also mentions two others of minor importance.

GLOUCESTER. [*Concilium Glocestriense.*] Held by Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, November 6th, 1378, in the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Gloucester. Four constitutions were made. Gloucester, 1378.

1. Enacted that they who celebrated Annals for the souls of deceased persons should have seven marks per annum stipend, or diet and three marks; others who served the cure of souls eight marks, or diet and four marks.

2. Forbids fornication, and orders that a priest negligent in enforcing this shall himself be, as the canons direct, punished as a fornicator, or one who connives at the sin.

3. Orders that the confessions of women be taken in an open place, where they may be seen, though not heard, by the people; that the laity be exhorted to confess in the very beginning of Lent, and immediately after sin; forbids a priest to *enjoin* masses as part of penance.

4. Orders that confessions be heard three times a year, viz. Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas, and enjoins previous abstinence; orders that they who neglect to confess once in the year, and to receive the communion at Easter, shall be forbidden entrance into church whilst living, and Christian burial when dead.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1378. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2051.

GOA. Gaspard, archbishop of Goa, convoked a council there in the year 1567, but being deposed in September in that same year, George Temudo, bishop of Cochin, his successor, confirmed his decree for the convocation of the council, and presided at it. Several regulations for the propagation of the faith were drawn up, which were afterwards confirmed by Pius V. in a bull bearing date January 1, 1570. The acts of this council were also confirmed in another, convoked for the purpose of enforcing them, at which moreover all idolatrous ceremonies were forbidden in the territories belonging to Portugal. Goa, 1567. Another, 1575.

GOA. Held in 1585 in the cathedral church of Goa. Goa, 1585.

Vincent de Fonseca, archbishop of Goa presided. Mar-Abraham, a Syrian prelate, in this council renounced Nestorianism; shortly after, however, he returned to his error.—*Sousa, Orien. Conq.* part ii.

Gran, in Hungary.

GRAN in HUNGARY. See C. STRIGONIA.

Gratlea, 925 or 928.

GRATLEA. [*Concilium Grateleanum.*] Held about the year 925 by king Ethelstan, Wulfhelm archbishop of Canterbury, and other bishops, being present. Twenty-six laws were made, of which the seven following are ecclesiastical.

1. Directs, by the king's order, that certain alms, &c. be given daily at his cost for the good of his soul.

2. Forbids church-breaking.

3. Is directed against witchcraft, secret acts of murder, &c.

4. Concerns the coin of the realm; appoints coiners at Canterbury, two of whom shall be the bishop's and one the abbot's; at Rochester, one of the bishop's; at London, Winchester, Lewes, Hastings, Chichester, Hampton, Werham, Exeter, Shaftesbury, and at others, one coiner.

5. Relates to ordeals.

6. Forbids all marketing on Sundays, under pain of forfeiting the goods and payment of thirty shillings.

7. Forbids to receive the oath of a man once perjured, and to bury him in consecrated ground, unless he hath during his life made satisfaction.

The Latin copies add certain other ecclesiastical laws and regulations, which were probably made in some subsequent council.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 582. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 205.

Guastalla, on the Po, 1106.

GUASTALLA. [*Concilium Guastallense.*] Held in October, 1106, by pope Pascal II. A large body of bishops and other ecclesiastics was present, together with the ambassadors of Henry, king of Germany, and the princess Matilda. The province of Emilia was separated from the metropolitan of Ravenna, on account of the insubordination of the latter towards Rome. A decree was passed against investitures by laymen, and the schismatical consecration of bishops and clerks allowed in those cases in which they had not been guilty of usurping their sees, of simony, or any other grievous crime.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 748.

H.

HABAM. [*Concilium Habense.*] Held about the year 1014, at Habam, or Badam (a place not identified), in England, in the reign of Ethelred. Eight canons were enacted. Habam, about 1014.

1. Enacts that God be loved and honoured before all things, and his mercy and assistance invoked with fasting, alms, confession, and abstinence from evil; that the king be obeyed; that one penny be paid for every ploughland, and that every hierman (parishioner) pay one penny, and every thane pay tithe of all that he hath.

2. Enacts that every Christian, of age, shall fast on bread and water, and raw herbs, before the feast of S. Michael for three days, during which time every man shall go to confession and to church barefoot, and every priest and his people shall go in procession; every priest shall say thirty masses, and every deacon and clerk thirty psalms; all servants shall be during these three days excused from work, and food be given by each person to the poor. There are many other regulations upon the same subject.

3. Orders the mass styled "Contra Paganos" be sung every morning for the king.

4. Orders the payment of church-shot and tithe.

5. Forbids to sell any one out of his native country under anathema.

6. Forbids robbery, and orders restitution when robbery has been committed.

7. Orders the payment of alms money at Michaelmas.

8. Relates to the office and duty of a judge.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons,* A. D. 1014. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 807. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 295.

HALLE. [*Concilium Hallense.*] A council was held at Halle, in the ecclesiastical province of Magdeburg, in the year 1176, by Wigbertus, the metropolitan. The object of the council was to discover some means of checking the mania for tournaments which then prevailed, and which no ecclesiastical censures had been found sufficient to restrain. The immediate subject before the council was the case of a nobleman, called Conrad, who had died in consequence of wounds received in such a meeting. It was decided that Christian burial should be refused to his body, unless clear Halle, in Suabia, 1176.

proof of his penitence should be given, and unless all the lords who implored this favour for him would take an oath to abstain in future from all tournays, and to discourage the passion for them in their dependants.—*Mansi, Supp. Coll. Conc.* tom. ii.

Hamburg, 1406. HAMBURG. [*Concilium Hamburgense.*] Held in 1406, by the archbishop of Bremen, in which the conduct of certain Franciscan friars was strongly condemned, who had taught the ignorant in the neighbourhood of Lubeck that every person dying in the habit of their order was undoubtedly saved, and that upon the yearly descent of S. Francis into purgatory they were taken out of its torments, and carried into heaven, however short a time they might have been there.—*Mansi, Supp.* Tom. iii. Coll. 771 and 772.

Hatfield, 680. HATFIELD. [*Concilium Hedfeldense.*] In September, 680, a council was held at Hatfield, in Hertfordshire; Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, presided. The first five œcumenical councils were received, and the decrees of the Church of Rome, 649, against the Monothelites, agreed to. In this council Theodore styles himself archbishop of the Island of Britain—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 577. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 51.

Hertford, 673. HERTFORD. [*Concilium Hertfordiense.*] Held on the 24th September, 673, by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury; the bishops of East Anglia (Bise), Rochester (Putta), Wessex (Lutherius), Mercia (Winfred), together with the deputies of Wilfred of Northumbria, and several canonists, were present; ten canons were drawn up.

1. Commands the observance of Easter day on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon in the first month.

2. Commands that no bishop shall intrude upon the parish (parochiam) of another bishop, but shall rest contented with the government of the people intrusted to him.

3. Enacts that it shall not be lawful for any bishop in any way to disturb or plunder any monastery.

4. Forbids monks to emigrate from one monastery to another without the permission of the abbot.

5. Forbids clerks to leave their own bishop and to wander about; forbids to receive them any where except they shall bring letters commendatory from their bishop.

6. Bishops and other clergy coming from another Church, to be contented with the hospitality shown to them, and not to presume to perform any office in the church without the permission of the bishop of that church.

7. Orders the holding of synods twice in every year; and adds, that since many things may operate to hinder this, one shall at any rate be called every year, on the kalends of August, in the place called Cloveshooh (or Cliffshoe).

8. Orders that bishops shall take precedence according to the date and order of their consecration.

9. Declares that the question was raised, whether the number of bishops ought to be increased in proportion to the increase of the faithful, but that nothing was determined.

10. Relates to marriages: forbids all unlawful marriages; forbids incest, and to divorce a wife except for fornication; forbids a man divorced from his wife to marry another woman.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 673. *Baronius*, A. D. 672. Tom. vi. Conc. p. 535. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 43.

HIERAPOLIS. Held about the year 197, by Apollinarius, bishop of the see, and twenty-six other bishops, who separated Montanus, Maximilian, and Theodotus, from the communion of the Church.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 599. Hierapolis, 197.

HIPPO. See Council of AFRICA for this year. Hippo, 393.

HIPPO. [*Concilium Hipponense.*] Held in 426, on Sunday, September 26. In this council S. Augustin, assisted by two bishops and seven priests, appointed Eradius his successor, with the assent of all the inhabitants of the place. He required that Eradius should abide in the priestly office until the time of his own death, in order to comply with the canon of Nicea, which forbids to consecrate any one to a see in the life-time of the actual bishop, which had been done, against his will, in the case of Augustin himself, who was, in a council held at Hippo in 395, consecrated bishop in the life-time of Valerius. Hippo, 426.

HOLMPATRICK. Held at Holmpatrick, in Ireland, in 1148, by the advice of the pope Innocentius II., under the following circumstances: Malachy O'Morgais, formerly archbishop of Armagh, having for some cause resigned the archiepiscopal chair, and retired Holmpatrick, 1148.

to the bishoprick of Down, journeyed to Rome to petition the pope to grant the pall to the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. He was well received by Innocentius, who, however, advised him to return to Ireland, and to convoke a national synod to consider the question, promising, upon a request from the synod, that the palls should be granted. In consequence, this synod was assembled, at which fifteen bishops and two hundred priests attended. The result was a formal petition to pope Eugenius III. (who had succeeded Innocentius, who died in the interim), which Malachy was commissioned to convey to Rome.—*Bp. Mant, Hist. of the Irish Church*, pp. 5, 6.

Huesca, in Spain, 598.

HUESCA. [*Concilium Oscense.*] Held in 598, two canons only are extant, one orders that the diocesan synods, composed of the abbots, priests, and deacons of the diocese, be held annually, in which the bishop shall exhort his clergy upon the duties of frugality and continence; the second orders the bishop to inform himself whether the priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, observe the law of continence.—Tom. v. Conc. 1604.

I.

Iconium, 230.

ICONIUM. [*Concilium Iconiense.*] Held about 230[2]. Composed of the bishops of the provinces of Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and of others in that vicinity. Baptism conferred out of the Church was declared to be absolutely null and void.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 751.

Illyrica, 372.

ILLYRICA. [*Concilium Illyricum.*] Held about 372, according to some, in 365, by order of the emperor Valentinian. A large number of bishops were present. After a long and profound investigation of the subject, they declared, in a synodal letter to the Churches of Asia, &c., that they recognized the consubstantiality of the Three Divine Persons, and utterly rejected with anathema those who denied it. A decree was published, containing the faith as set forth at Nicea, in which the fathers declared that they held the same faith with the councils lately convoked at Rome

[2] According to Labbe, in 256 or 258, during the time when Stephen was bishop (or pope) of Rome.

and in Gaul, viz., that there is one only and the same substance of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in Three Persons.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 830.

INGELHEIM. [*Concilium Ingelenheimense.*] Held June 27, 948, in the presence of the emperor, Otho I., and king Louis Outremer. Marinus, the Roman legate, presided; and thirty-two bishops, together with many abbots, canons, and monks, attended. King Louis complained of the persecution which he endured from Hugo, count of Paris; also Artalidus of Rheims made complaint against Hugo, his competitor in the see of Rheims. Sigebold, the deacon of the last-mentioned Hugo, was deposed by the council as a calumniator, Hugo excommunicated, and Artalidus re-instated. It was also decreed that Hugo, count of Paris, should be excommunicated, unless he would submit to the judgment of the council. Ten canons were published. Ingelheim, 948.

The three first relate to the above-mentioned excommunication of Hugo de Vermandois and his deacon, and to the threatened excommunication of the count of Paris.

4. Forbids any layman to present any clerk to a church, or to dispossess him of it, without the consent of the bishop.

6. Orders that the *whole* of Easter-week be kept as a festival, and the three days following Whit-Sunday.

7. Orders that S. Mark's day be kept with fasting, on account of the great Litany, as was done on the rogation days preceding the feast of the Ascension.

9. Orders that all differences as to tithe be settled in an ecclesiastical synod, instead of in the civil courts. See C. of VERNUM and MONSON.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 623.

IRELAND. [*Concilium Hibernicum.*] Held about 456. The canons of this council are thirty-four in number, and have the names of S. Patrick and two other bishops, one named Auxilius, and the other Jeserinus (or Iserninus), at their head. They are addressed to the priests, deacons, and other clergy. Ireland, 456.

6. Orders that those of the clergy, from the ostiarius to the priest, who do not dress with proper decency, and who do not keep their hair cut short, after the Roman fashion, or whose wives go about unveiled, shall be separated from the Church.

Ireland, 456.

7. Enjoins all clerks, unless in a state of slavery [3], to be present every day and night at the holy office.

9. Forbids all suspicious intercourse between monks and nuns, not allowing them to frequent the same hostelry, or to drive about the country in the same carriage.

10. Is directed against those of the clergy who are careless and negligent in saying the office, and who wear their hair long.

11. Excommunicates those who receive excommunicated clerks.

12 and 13. Forbids to receive alms from an excommunicated person, or to receive the offerings of the heathens.

14. Orders one year of penitence for the sins of homicide or fornication, and for consulting wizards.

15. Orders six months' penance for a theft, twenty days of which term are to be spent fasting upon bread alone.

18. Refuses an entrance into the Church even on Easter night, to all excommunicated persons who have not been admitted to penance.

19 and 22. Excommunicates a woman who leaves her husband, and marries another man; and her father also, if he is consenting to the act.

20. Excommunicates those who refuse to pay their debts.

21. Excommunicates a Christian who, having a cause against another Christian, brings it before the civil courts instead of referring it to the Church.

23. Orders that if a priest have built a church, he shall not offer there until the bishop have consecrated it.

24. Forbids a stranger establishing himself in any place to baptize, or to celebrate the communion, or to consecrate, or even to build a church, without first obtaining the bishop's permission.

25. Directs that during the time which the bishop shall pass at each church in his diocese, all the offerings then made by the faithful shall be at his disposal, to be applied either to his own use, or to that of the poor.

29. Orders that all candidates for holy baptism shall fast for forty days previously, and forbids that sacrament to be administered to them otherwise.

[3] "Nisi forte jugo servitutis sit detentus."

30. Allows a bishop to celebrate the holy Eucharist when out of his own diocese on Sundays, but forbids him to ordain without the diocesan's permission.

33. Forbids all British clergymen, coming over to Ireland, to exercise their functions, unless they bring a letter from their bishop.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1478. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 2.

IRELAND. Another council was held somewhere about the same time. Attributed also to S. Patrick, although the heading of it bears neither his name, nor that of any other bishop; and there is no decisive evidence to determine either the place of holding or the date. The mention in the second canon of a heathen population still existing, shows that it is to be referred to a period not very remote from the last.

Ireland, about the same time.

Thirty-two canons in all were published.

1. Forbids all communication with sinners, probably meaning excommunicated persons.

2. Forbids to receive any thing at the hand of the *heathen* ("iniquorum"), except food and clothing, when absolutely necessary; because a lamp takes only the oil it needs to support it.

7. Forbids to rebaptize any who have received the outward form, by whomsoever administered; since the iniquity of the sower infects not the seed itself.

9. Forbids the ministers of the Church who have fallen into any sin forbidden by the canons, to be ever again admitted to the exercise of their functions; but permits them to retain their ecclesiastical title.

16. Declares the election of a bishop, not made as the apostle enjoins, by another bishop, to be null and void.

17. Directs that the monks shall live in solitude, without worldly riches, under the controul of the bishop or abbot, renouncing every thing beyond the bare necessaries of life, as being called upon to suffer cold, and nakedness, and hunger, and thirst, and watchings, and fastings.

18. Bishops and doctors are here declared to be the seed that brought forth a hundredfold; clergymen and chaste widows, that which produced sixtyfold; and laymen perfectly believing the Holy Trinity, that which increased thirtyfold. There are none but these in the Lord's harvest, and monks and nuns are ranked in the highest class.

19. Prescribes eight days for catechising before baptism; and fixes the season for administering that holy sacrament at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Epiphany.

22. Declares that person to be an infidel who refuses to communicate on Easter-night.

25. Forbids to marry a brother's wife; because the wife being one flesh with her husband, she is, in fact, sister to the husband's brother.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1482. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 4.

Ireland, 684. IRELAND. Another council was held in Ireland in the year 684, according to Mansi, who adds, that the canons of this and of other councils held about this time, form together the code known as the "Irish Code [4]." The canons of this council are chiefly directed against sins of impurity, for which they appoint various kinds of penance.—*Mansi*, t. i. Supp. col. 513 and 514.

Ireland, 1097. IRELAND. Held in 1097. In this council, a petition was drawn up and sent to Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, by the king of Ireland, Murchertacus, and by the Irish bishops and others, that he would erect the city of Waterford into a bishopric, on account of its increasing population, which he did; Malchus, a monk, was consecrated the first bishop of that see.—*Labbe*, x. p. 613. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. 1. p. 374.

Isle, 1288. ISLE (IN COMPTAT VENAISSIN). [*Concilium Insulanum.*] Held in 1288, by Rostang de Capoc, archbishop of Arles, assisted by four bishops and the deputies of four who were absent. They republished many of the canons made in the former councils of the province, and added one new one, to the effect that a god-parent should give to the infant only the alb, or white dress, in which it was to be christened.

Italy, 381. ITALY. [*Concilium Italicum.*] Held by S. Ambrose. The acts of this council remaining to us are only two letters, addressed to the emperor Theodosius, which may be seen in S. Ambrose, Ep. 13 and 14.—*Sozom.* vii. c. ii.

[4] Part of this code is given in the Spicilegium of D'Achery, tom. i. p. 491. In chap. ix., amongst other qualifications necessary for a bishop is the following: "Qui vero accessu adolescentiæ usque ad trigesimum annum ætatis suæ probabiliter vixerit unâ tantum uxore, virgine sumptâ, contextus, quinque annis subdiaconus, et quinque annis diaconus, quadragesimo anno presbyter, quinquagesimo episcopus stet."

J.

JASSY. Held at Jassy, in Moldavia, in 1642, under Parthenius, patriarch of Constantinople. The eighteen articles of the confession attributed to Cyril Lucar were condemned, and the orthodox confession of Peter Mogila, as revised by Meletius Syrica at Constantinople, examined and approved; three prelates and several priests were present [5]. Jassy, 1642.

JACA. [*Concilium Jaccetanum.*] Held in 1060. In this synod the see of Huesca was transferred to Jaca, and the Roman ritual introduced to the place of the Gothic.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1111. Jaca, 1060.

JERUSALEM. [*Concilium Hierosolymitanum.*] The FIRST ecclesiastical council was that mentioned in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles; it was assembled at Jerusalem about the year 50, under S. James the less, bishop of Jerusalem, in consequence of the schism in the Church of Antioch upon the subject of circumcision, stirred up (it is probable) by Cerinthus. S. James pronounced the decision of the council, which charged the members of the Church to abstain:— Jerusalem, 50.

1. From meats which had been offered to idols.
2. From blood and things strangled.
3. From fornication.

The first of these prohibitions is plainly directed against the slightest participation, even in appearance, with the idol worship of the heathen.

The second appears to have been intended to prevent offence to the Jewish converts, and to draw together the Jews and Gentiles.

The third was directed against the prevailing vice of the Gentile world.

JERUSALEM. Held in 349, by Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, and about sixteen other bishops, upon the return of S. Athanasius to Alexandria after the death of the intruder Gregory. In this council the bishops received Athanasius with great respect, and professed deep regret for having formerly been compelled to sign the decree against him; finally, they drew up a synodal letter to the Church in Alexandria.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 724. Jerusalem, 349.

JERUSALEM. Held in 399, in consequence of a Jerusalem, 399.

[5] See C. CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 1642.

synodal letter received from Theophilus of Alexandria, making known the decree which he had passed in council against the Origenists. The bishops of the patriarchate of Jerusalem replied by a common letter, in which having expressed their grief for the evils which the followers of Origen had caused to the Catholics, they assured Theophilus that they agreed in the above-mentioned judgment. And concluded by stating their resolution not to admit to their communion any whom he had condemned for believing the Son to be, in any sense, inferior to the Father.—*Mansi, Supp.* t. 1, coll. 271.

Jerusalem, 453. JERUSALEM. Held in 453, upon the re-establishment of Juvenal, and expulsion of Theodosius. Juvenal, who had been deposed for his concurrence in the oppression of Flavianus in the Latrocinium at Ephesus, was afterwards, in the œcumenical council of Chalcedon, restored. But during his absence a monk named Theodosius, a zealous advocate of the Eutychian heresy, taking advantage of the opportunity, published various calumnious statements against the council of Chalcedon, and prejudiced both the empress Eudoxia and all the monks of the patriarchate against Juvenal; by such means he succeeded in intruding himself into the see of Jerusalem; and for twenty months he retained possession of it, committing every kind of excess and wickedness. In this year, however, the emperor Marcian re-established Juvenal, and Theodosius fled to mount Sinai.

Jerusalem, 518. JERUSALEM. Held in 518, under the patriarch, John III., composed of thirty-three bishops, gathered from the three Palestines. All the acts of the council of Constantinople were confirmed, and the Severians and Eutychians condemned, in a synodal letter addressed to John of Constantinople.—*Baronius.* Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1588.

Jerusalem, 536. JERUSALEM. Held in 536, September 19, under the patriarch Peter, composed of forty-five bishops, who approved the acts of the council of Constantinople of the same year, in the matter of Anthymus, patriarch of the latter see, and a Monothelite, who had been deposed, and Menai elected in his stead. Severus, Peter, and Zoaras, and other Acephalists, were also condemned.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 275.

JERUSALEM. Held in 553, in which all the bishops of Palestine received the acts of the fifth œcumenical council at Constantinople, with the exception of Alexander of Abilene, who, in consequence, was deposed.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 739. Jerusalem, 553.

JERUSALEM. Held in 634; in this council Sophronus, the patriarch, addressed a synodal letter to the different patriarchs, informing them of his election, and urging them to oppose the heresy of the Monothelites. Jerusalem, 634.

JERUSALEM. Held in April, 1443, under Arsenius, metropolitan of Cesarea, in Cappadocia; Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem, being present. It was decreed that no clerk, ordained by the oriental bishops in communion with Rome, should be permitted to exercise his office, until he had in the presence of the orthodox bishops satisfactorily proved his piety and adhesion to the faith of the Greek Church.—*Mansi, Note to Raynaldus*, Tom. ix. p. 420. Jerusalem, 1443.

JERUSALEM. See C. Bethlehem, a.d. 1672. Jerusalem, 1672.

JUNCA, in Africa. [*Concilium Juncense.*] In the year 524, a council was held at Junca or Junga, in Africa, at which Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa, presided. The subject brought before it was the case of Vincentius, a bishop, who had extended his jurisdiction over places which did not belong to his diocese.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1627. Junca, in Africa, 524.

K.

KELLS. Held at Kells, in Ireland, March 9th, 1152, by John Paparo, cardinal, priest, and legate apostolic of Eugenius III., whom the latter had sent into Ireland to confer the pall upon four archbishops, of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, which was done in this synod. Some of the Irish bishops as well as of the inferior clergy, refused to obey the legatine summons, and to sanction by their presence this innovation. (See Council of Holmpatrick, a.d. 1148.)—*Bp. Mant. Hist. Irish Church*, p. 6. Tom. x. Conc. p. 1130. Kells, 1152.

KIEFF. Held about 1147, by order of Isagaslaff II., prince of Kieff; Onuphrius of Chernigoff presided. Theodore of Bielgorod, and several other bishops were Kieff, 1147.

present, who proceeded to the election of a metropolitan, in the place of Michael II. With the exception of Niphont of Novogorod, they all agreed to take the election into their own hands, without allowing to the patriarch of Constantinople the exercise of his right either to nominate or confirm. Niphont strongly protested against the step, but without effect. The choice of the synod fell upon Clement, a monk of Smolensko. As a substitute for the patriarchal consecration, Onuphrius proposed that the hand of S. Clement of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson, should be placed upon his head.

This election led to great disorder; and subsequently the patriarch, Luke Chysoberges, consecrated Constantine metropolitan, who condemned the acts of this synod, and suspended, for a time, all the clergy ordained by Clement.—*Mouravieff's Hist. Russ. Church, by Blackmore*, p. 35.

Kieff, 1622. KIEFF. Held by Job, metropolitan of Kieff, in 1622. Meletius, archbishop of Polotsk, at one time a most zealous defender of the orthodox Church in Russia, had been obliged to flee into Greece, upon a groundless suspicion of having been concerned in the murder of Jehoshaphat, the Uniate archbishop of Polotsk, and urged by fear, had given himself up to the Uniate party, and written an apology in censure of the orthodox Church; in this council he was called to account—made to perform open penance, and to tear his book.

Soon after he entirely apostatized; and, going to Rome, had the title of archbishop of Hieropolis conferred on him.—*Mouravieff*, p. 179.

Kieff, about 1636. KIEFF. Held by the celebrated Peter Mogila, metropolitan of Kieff, in order to revise his book, entitled, "The Orthodox Confession of Faith," written to confirm his people, distracted by contradictory doctrines, in the true faith.

Kingsbury, 851. KINGSBURY. [*Concilium Kingsburiæ.*] Held in 851, at Kingsbury, under Bertulphus, king of the Mercians; Ceolnoth, archbishop of Dover, and other Mercian bishops being present. A charter was granted by the king to the abbey of Croyland, containing very extensive privileges.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 73.

Kingston, 838. KINGSTON. [*Concilium Kingstoniæ.*] Held in 838. Egbert, king of the West Saxons, being present,

and Ceolnuth, archbishop of Dover, (or Canterbury,) presiding. In it Egbert and his son made a free donation of the manor of Malling, in Sussex, to the Church of Christ, and those who should at any future time dare to violate this gift, were declared to be separated from God, and it was prayed that their lot might be with the devil and his angels. Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1769.

KIRTLINGTON. [*Concilium Kirtlingtonense.*] Held about Easter, 977, in the presence of king Edward, Dunstan presiding. The chief event recorded in this council[6] was the sudden death of Sideman, bishop of Crediton, in Devonshire, in which church the deceased had provided in his last will that he should be interred; but Dunstan and the king commanded him to be buried at St. Mary's Abingdon, where he was honourably interred in the northern part, in the porch of St. Paul.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. 1. p. 262. Kirtlington, 977.

L.

LAMBESSE. [*Concilium Lampesanum.*] Held in 240, at Lambese, or Lambesse, in Numidia, composed of ninety bishops, who condemned Privatus, the bishop of the see, accused of heresy and other crimes.—*Cyp. Ep.* 39, *adv. Corn.* Tom. i. Conc. p. 650. Lambesse, 240.

LAMBETH. [*Concilium Lambethense.*] Held May 13, 1261, by archbishop Boniface. Twenty constitutions were published. Lambeth, 1261.

1. Forbids prelates to appear before any secular court, when called there by the king's letters to answer upon matters which are known to concern merely their office and court ecclesiastical; directs them in such cases, either in person or by letter, to inform the king of their inability to obey his order; declares that any sheriff or bailiff making any such attachment, &c., shall be excommunicated (or suspended, if a clerk). This constitution contains much more on the same subject.

2. When a man has recovered his right of advowson in the king's court, the bishop shall admit the clerk presented by him, if the living be vacant; if not, he shall excuse himself to the king accordingly.

[6] The transactions of this council are, according to Inett, as little known as the place itself.

Lambeth, 1261.

3. Forbids lay investitures; excommunicates and deprives, *ipso facto*, those who have been admitted to benefices by laymen, &c.

4. Directs that excommunicated persons, who have been released from prison by the civil powers without due satisfaction made to the Church, shall be again solemnly excommunicated with bells tolling and candles lighted; also that the officer who released them shall be excommunicated, or otherwise punished, at the discretion of the ordinary; also directs that when the king shall refuse to execute a writ "de excommunicato capiendo," after a monition from the bishop, all his cities, castles, &c., in that diocese, shall be put under an interdict.

5. Orders that those who, when required by the ordinary to do so, refuse to surrender clerks of known good character accused of any crime, shall be excommunicated; and that the places where such clerks are so detained shall be put under an interdict.

Enacts the same with respect to wandering clerks unknown, who are so seized; forbids prelates to compel clerks to pay fines inflicted by secular judges; pronounces censures upon those who caused clerks to be hanged, or shaved their heads whilst in custody, in order to erase the mark of their clerkship.

6. Relates to the evasion of contracts made by laymen with the clergy, by means of the king's prohibition, &c.

7. Directs that Jews offending against ecclesiastical things and persons, shall be compelled to answer before an ecclesiastical judge, by being forbidden to traffic or converse with the faithful.

8. Forbids to hinder necessary food from being brought to those who have taken refuge in a church; enacts that they who drag such persons from their sanctuary, or kill them, shall be punished with all the punisment of sacrilege[7]. Forbids any lay power to set guards over them that have fled for refuge into a church.

9. Relates to the invaders and disturbers of Church property.

[7] The ecclesiastical punishment was excommunication; by the civil law, sacrilegious persons were sometimes hanged, or burnt alive, or banished.

Lambeth, 1261.

10. Declares that frequently the houses of the clergy, though within sanctuary, were seized by the great men, their servants driven out, their goods consumed, &c. Enacts that all such offenders shall be excommunicated until they have made restitution.

11. Relates to the plunder of vacant Churches in the king's guardianship, made by his escheators and bailiffs, and orders the prelates who have the jurisdiction, publicly and solemnly to forbid such acts, and to excommunicate all offenders; and adds further, "if our lord, the king, upon a monition, do not make, or cause to be made, competent restitution for the damages done by his officers, let him be proceeded against as hath been ordained in other cases touching the king (see Constitution 1).

12. Permits archbishops and bishops to appear by their attorneys when summoned to attend the king's justices, and orders that if any justice shall condemn any such prelate on account of his not appearing in person, the attachers and distressors shall be proceeded against. Also relates to the case of prelates and clergymen called upon to show by what right they use the liberties long enjoyed by their Churches, &c.

13. Enacts that those lay persons shall be visited with Church censures who endeavour to compel the clergy holding lands in *Frank Almoine*[8], to do suit and service for the same.

14. Relates to the case of judges who defrauded Churches, &c., of their possessions, by perverse interpretations of the original deeds of gift.

15. Relates to the effects of a deceased person, wills, and their administration. Forbids any religious to act as executor of a will without licence of the ordinary; excommunicates a man hindering any woman, married or single, or his own wife, from making her will.

16. Excommunicates persons making false suggestions to the king against prelates and ecclesiastical judges, whereby the latter receive damage.

17. Declares that the king and other great men did often hinder the prelates from doing their duty against offenders, by forbidding laymen to take the oaths for speaking the truth, and by refusing to permit

[8] See note to Constitutions of Clarendon.

the said prelates to impose corporal or pecuniary punishment on their vassals; declares that they who do so shall be coerced by sentences of excommunication and interdict; and that they who refuse to take the oaths shall be excommunicated.

18. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to hinder any one who desires it, from having the sacrament of confession and penance administered, especially forbids so to hinder its administration to prisoners.

19. Forbids the beadles and apparitors of deans and archdeacons, when in execution of any order they enter the houses of any of the clergy, to exact any procurations, &c., and orders them to receive thankfully what is given to them; also forbids them to employ any sub-officials, and to pass sentence of excommunication, interdict, or suspension, of their own mere will.

20. Orders that bishops in their synods, and archdeacons in their chapters, and all parochial clergy, shall three times a year give public notice that all clerks must be decently clipped, and have a shaven crown.

21. "With a special injunction," ordains that there shall be two prisons in every diocese, sufficiently large and secure for the incarceration of refractory and immoral clerks, and for the perpetual imprisonment of such of them as have committed crimes for which they would have forfeited their lives if laymen.

Some copies add another constitution, concerning the conferring the benefices of the holy water upon poor clerks, and directs that such benefices shall be in the gift of the rectors, or vicars, of the respective parishes, and not the parishioners. There is a doubt whether this is not to be attributed to archbishop Winchelsea. —*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 803.

Lambeth, 1281.

LAMBETH. Held October 11th, 1281, by John Peckham, archbishop. In this council the acts of the council of Lyons (1274), the constitutions of the council of London (1268), and those of the preceding council of Lambeth (1261), were confirmed, and twenty-seven fresh canons were published.

1. Orders that all priests shall consecrate at least once a week; that the holy sacrament shall be kept in the pyx locked up in the tabernacle; that a bell shall be sounded at the elevation of the host, that those who cannot attend mass may kneel, whether they be at home

or abroad, that the people shall be taught that Christ is *entire* in either species. Lambeth, 1281.

2. Relates to masses for the dead.

3. Forbids to baptize those who have received the right form of baptism at the hands of laymen or women; permits the conditional form to be used where the priest doubts whether the true form was employed; forbids lascivious names to be given to children, and directs that when such has been the case, the bishop shall change them at confirmation.

4. Denies the holy communion to persons not confirmed.

5. Forbids to confer on any one holy orders at the same time with the four lesser orders [9]; and desires that when it may be, the lesser orders shall not be received at one and the same time.

6. Denies absolution to hardened sinners (while they continue in sin), and to those who persist in holding more than one benefice. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, any one to hear confessions without the licence of the bishop.

7. Orders public penance for notorious sins, reserves the absolution of wilful murder to the bishop only.

8. Renews the regulation directing that in each deanery there shall be a general confessor for all the clergy.

9. Treats of the instruction to be given by the clergy to their flocks, and directs them to explain four times a year in the vulgar tongue, the creed, the ten commandments, the two evangelical precepts, the seven works of mercy, the seven mortal sins, the seven cardinal virtues, and the seven sacraments. Then follows a brief exposition of them all.

10. Orders the publication of sentences of excommunication published by archbishop Peckham and his predecessor.

11. Orders rectors to exercise due hospitality, at least to relieve the extreme necessities of the poor and those who travel to preach the word of God (*i. e.* the friars).

12. Relates to the certificates given by the rural deans.

[9] The four lesser orders are, the ostiary, the lector or reader, the exorcist, and the acolyth; the superior or holy order, the sub-deacon, deacon, and priest.

13. Is directed against the fraudulent methods employed to get possession of benefices during the absence of their possessors.

14. Relates to the same.

15. Renews the sixteenth canon of Langton, at Oxford, 1222, against farming churches.

16. Orders all the houses of Augustines to assemble together in the general chapter.

17. Excommunicates those who attempt the chastity of nuns.

18. Forbids nuns to stay more than three days together in any house, even in that of their parents, and then requires that they shall have a sister nun with them. Declares that both nuns and monks who have observed for a year the monastic life, and have worn the habit, shall be considered *ipso facto* professed.

19. Provides for the reclamation of relapsed religious.

20. Forbids monks to become executors to wills.

21. Strictly forbids clergymen to dress like soldiers and laymen, and to wear coifs or hairlaces in order to hide the crown upon their heads.

22. Forbids the sons of rectors to succeed immediately to their fathers in churches where they ministered.

23. Orders bishops to give to every clerk upon his admission to a benefice, letters patent testifying his admission, &c.

24. Forbids pluralities; and orders those who possess more than one benefice to resign them within six months.

25. Relates to the office of advocate.

26. Orders that when an archbishop, or bishop, dies, every priest, regular or secular, under his jurisdiction shall say one mass for his soul; and the other bishops in their next congregation say an office for the dead in his behalf.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1156. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons.*

Lambeth, 1330.

LAMBETH. Held in 1330, by Simon Mepham, archbishop. Ten canons were published.

1. Provides that the linen used at the altar shall be frequently washed; that the priests shall not proceed to say mass until they have said matins, lauds, prime, and tierce; that no clerk shall serve at the altar during mass without a surplice, and that mass shall not be said without one or two lights.

2. Prescribes rules for the regulation of confessions.

3. Forbids priests guilty of mortal sin to celebrate the holy communion before having confessed, and orders that there shall be a confessor for the clergy in every deanery.

4. Directs that the holy chrism shall be reverently carried to the sick, and shall be kept under lock and key.

5. Relates to marriage and the publication of banns.

6. Relates to the conferring of holy orders and to the examination of candidates.

7. Forbids the alienation of Church property by laymen without the bishop's sanction.

8. Forbids to let benefices to lay persons to farm; also forbids the clergy to build houses for their children or concubines upon a lay fee, out of the revenue of the church.

9. Forbids any person to embrace a recluse life without the bishop's permission.

10. Orders an annual publication, three or four times, of the general sentence of excommunication against sorcerers, perjurers, incendiaries, usurers, thieves, &c.[1] —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1784. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1330.

LAMBETH. Held in 1351, by Simon, archbishop and legate, to oppose the encroachments of the secular judges, who violated the privileges of the clergy, and condemned to death clerks found guilty of heavy crimes; at the same time severe rules were laid down for the treatment of guilty clerks handed over to the Church for punishment by the secular powers.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1927. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Lambeth, 1351.

LAMBETH. Held in 1362, by Simon Islip, archbishop, a constitution was drawn up in condemnation of the avarice and idleness of the priests; at the same time the rate of payment for chaplains and curates having cure of souls, was fixed.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1362. Lambeth, 1362.

LAMBETH. Held about 1367, by Simon Langham, archbishop of Canterbury, probably at Lambeth. Three constitutions were published. Lambeth, 1367.

[1] Johnson says that it may be justly doubted whether archbishop Mepham had any share in the making of these constitutions; they bear no date, and are attributed to Mepham by Sir H. Spelman, p. 498.

1. Relates to mortuaries.

2. Forbids scot-ales and drinking bouts; declares that when any number of men exceeding ten stay long together in the same house for drinking sake, it is a drinking bout. Offenders to be suspended from entrance into church and participation in the sacrament till they should have humbly done penance.

3. Forbids any priest to celebrate mass twice a day, except on Christmas-day and Easter Sunday, and when he has a corpse to bury in his own church. Offenders to be suspended.

These three constitutions are attributed by Sir H. Spelman (vol. ii. p. 133) to archbishop Langton, and are by him said to have been made A. D. 1206, and are so given in the Coll. Councils, Tom. ix. p. 30; but Johnson attributes them to the above archbishop Langham, for this reason, that the first constitution refers to a statute previously made by "our predecessor *Robert* concerning mortuaries," viz. Robert Winchelsea, A. D. 1305.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons. Preface to Langton's Constitutions*, A. D. 1222, and A. D. 1367.

Lambeth, 1368. LAMBETH. Held by the same archbishop in 1368, in which thirty erroneous propositions were condemned. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2034. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii, p. 75.

Lampsacus, 364. Pseudo-Council. LAMPSACUS. [*Lampsacenum Conciliabulum.*] Held by the Semi-Arians in 364, and lasted two months. The acts of the pseudo-council of Constantinople, under Acacius of Cesarea and Eudoxus of Antioch, in 360 were annulled. The Formulary of Antioch (A. D. 341) was confirmed, and that of Ariminum condemned. It was further ordered that the bishops who had been deposed by the Arians should be re-established in their sees. Eudoxus and Acacius were cited to appear, and upon their refusal were deposed.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 829.

Landaff, 560 (or 597, *Wilkins*). LANDAFF. [*Concilium Landavense.*] About the year 560 three councils were held by Oudoceus, third bishop of Landaff, in one of which he excommunicated Mouricus, king of Glamorgan.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 828—830. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 17.

Landaff, 895 (or 887, *Wilkins*). LANDAFF. Held about the year 895. The number of bishops present is unknown, but they appear to have been men of bold and intrepid spirit, neither cloaking the vices of their great men, nor sparing the

infliction of the canonical censures which their sins had deserved. Thus a certain petty king called Theudur was excommunicated by Gurvanus, tenth bishop of Landaff, for homicide and perjury, in this or some other synod held about this time.—*Pagi*, note vi. *Baron*, A. D. 895. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 196.

Landaff, 950 (or 955, *Wilkins*).

LANDAFF. Held about the year 950 by Peter, bishop of Landaff, in the case of a deacon who, after murdering a peasant, had fled to the altar for sanctuary, and was there put to death.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 637. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 222.

Landaff, 988 (or 982, *Wilkins*).

LANDAFF. Held in 988, in which a certain king Arthmailus, who had killed his brother, was excommunicated, until he should have performed the required penance. Gucaunus, bishop of Landaff, presided.—*Spelman.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 732. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 264.

Landaff, 1056 (or 1059, *Wilkins*).

LANDAFF. Held in 1056, by Hergualdus, twenty-ninth bishop of Landaff, in which the family of king Cargucaunus was excommunicated, on account of some violence offered by them to a nephew of the bishop, a physician, whom they cruelly treated during the festival of Christ's nativity, when they were in a state of intoxication. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1083. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 314[2].

Langeais, 1278.

LANGEAIS. [*Concilium Langesiense.*] Held in 1278, by John de Montsoreau, archbishop of Tours, in which sixteen canons were published.

8. Forbids to let out benefices to farm without the consent of the diocesan.

9. Forbids to excommunicate generally all persons communicating with the excommunicated.

12. Forbids to receive into any religious house more inmates than its funds will maintain.

13. Orders that there shall be more than one monk in each priory.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1038.

Langres, 859.

LANGRES. [*Concilium Lingonense.*] Held in 859, April 9, Remigius of Lyons and Agilmar of Vienne presiding. Sixteen canons were drawn up, which were read and approved at the council of Savonieres, or

[2] There are several other synods at Landaff mentioned by Wilkins; but since almost all of them exhibit similar scenes of outrage on the part of the petty princes, and excommunication on that of the Church, it is needless to notice more of them.

Tousi, in the same year (which see).—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 673, 690.

Laodicea, in Lydia, or Phrygia, between 314 and 372.

LAODICEA (in Lydia or Phrygia). [*Concilium Laodicenum.*] The year in which this council was assembled is disputed. Baronius and Binius assign the year 314; Pagi, 363; Hardouin places it as late as 372, and others even in 399. Beveridge adduces some probable reasons for supposing it to have been held in 365. Thirty-two bishops were present, from different provinces of Asia, and sixty canons were published, which are received into the code of the universal Church.

1. Permits the holy communion to be administered to those persons who have married a second time, after they shall have spent some time in retreat, with fasting and prayer.

2. Directs that the holy communion shall be given to those who have completed their course of penance.

3. Forbids to raise neophytes to the sacerdotal order.

4. Forbids usury amongst the clergy.

5. Forbids to confer holy orders in the presence of those who are in the rank of hearers.

6. Forbids all heretics to enter within the church.

7. Directs that when any of the Novatians, Photinians, or Quartodecimani are to be received into the Church, they shall be made to abjure every heresy, be instructed in the true faith, anointed with the holy chrism, and afterwards be admitted to communion.

8. Orders that all Cataphrygians or Montanists shall be instructed and baptized before they are received.

9. Excommunicates those of the faithful who go to the places of worship or burial grounds of heretics.

10. Forbids the faithful to give their children in marriage to heretics.

11. Forbids the ordination of priestesses (πρεσβύτιδες).

12. Orders that the bishops shall be appointed by the metropolitan and his provincials.

13. Forbids to give the election of priests to the people.

14. Forbids to send the holy things (i. e. the consecrated elements) into other parishes at Easter by way of eulogiæ.

15. Directs that only those chanters whose names are inscribed in the church roll shall ascend the pulpit and chant.

16. Directs that the Gospels shall be read as well as the other books of Scripture on Saturday. Laodicea, between 314 and 372.

17. Directs that a lesson shall be read between each psalm.

18. Directs that the same prayer shall be repeated at nones as at vespers.

19. Directs that after the bishop's sermon, shall be said separately the prayers for the catechumens, then those for the penitents, and lastly, those of the faithful; after which the kiss of peace shall be given, and after the priests have given it to the bishop, the lay persons present shall give it to each other; and that ended, the administration of the holy eucharist shall proceed. It orders further, that none except the priests shall be permitted to approach the altar in order to communicate.

20. Forbids a deacon to sit in the presence of a priest without permission of the latter. The same conduct is enjoined to sub-deacons and all inferior clergy towards the deacon.

21 and 22. Forbids the sub-deacon to undertake any of the functions of the deacon, to touch the sacred vessels, or to wear a stole.

23. Forbids the same to chanters and readers.

24. Forbids all the clergy, and those of the order of ascetics, to enter a tavern.

25. Forbids the sub-deacon to give the consecrated bread and to bless the cup.

26. Prohibits persons not appointed thereto by a bishop, to meddle with exorcisms.

27. Forbids the carrying away of any portion of the agapæ, or love-feasts.

28. Forbids the celebration of the agapæ, or love-feasts, in churches.

29. Forbids Christians to observe the Jewish sabbath.

30. Forbids Christian men, especially the clergy, to bathe with women.

31. Forbids to give daughters in marriage to heretics.

32. Forbids to receive the eulogiæ [3] of heretics.

33. Forbids all Catholics to pray with heretics and schismatics.

34. Anathematizes those who go after the false martyrs of heretics.

[3] "*Eulogiæ*:" portions of the consecrated elements were so called, which, in the early ages, were sent from one bishop to another, as tokens of intercommunion.

Laodicea, between 314 and 372.

35. Forbids Christian persons to leave their church in order to attend private conventicles in which angels were invoked; and anathematizes those who are guilty of this idolatry.

36. Forbids the clergy to deal in magic; and directs that all who wear phylacteries be cast out of the Church.

37. Forbids to fast with Jews or heretics.

38. Forbids to receive unleavened bread from Jews.

39. Forbids to feast with heathen persons.

40. Orders all bishops to attend the synods to which they are summoned, unless prevented by illness.

41 and 42. Forbid clergymen to leave the diocese to travel abroad, without the bishop's permission and the canonical letters.

43. Forbids the porter of the church to leave the gate for a moment, even in order to pray.

44. Forbids women to enter into the altar.

45. Forbids to receive those who do not present themselves for the Easter baptism before the second week in Lent.

46. Orders that all catechumens to be baptized shall know the Creed by heart, and shall repeat it before the bishop or priest on the fifth day of the week.

47. Those who have been baptized in sickness, if they recover, must learn the Creed.

48. Orders that those who have been baptized shall be anointed with the holy chrism, and partake of the kingdom of God.

49. Forbids to celebrate the holy eucharist during Lent on any days but Saturdays and Sundays.

50. Forbids to eat any thing on the Thursday in the last week of Lent; or during the whole of Lent, any thing except dry food.

51. Forbids to celebrate the festivals of the martyrs during Lent; orders remembrance of them on Saturdays and Sundays.

52. Forbids to celebrate marriages and birth-day feasts during Lent.

53. Enjoins proper behaviour at marriage festivals, and forbids all dancing.

54. Forbids the clergy to attend the shows and dances given at weddings.

55. None of the clergy or laity to club together for drinking parties.

56. Forbids the priests to take their seats in the

sanctuary before the bishop enters, except he be ill or absent.

57. Directs that bishops shall not be placed in small towns or villages, but simply visitors, who shall act under the direction of the bishop in the city.

58. Forbids both bishops and priests to celebrate the holy eucharist in private houses.

59. Forbids to sing uninspired hymns, &c., in church, and to read the uncanonical books.

60. Declares which are the canonical books of Scripture. In this list the Apocrypha and the Book of the Revelation are omitted.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 1495.

LATERAN. [*Concilium Lateranense.*] Also known as the council of Rome, held in 649, against the heresy of the Monothelites, and its promoters, Cyrus, Sergius, Paul, and Pyrrhus. The pope S. Martin was present, and presided over about one hundred and four bishops, from Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa. They held five sessions (or *secretarii*), the first being on the 5th October, and the last on the 31st of the same month. Lateran, 649.

In the first S. Martin explained the errors of Monothelism, introduced eighteen years back by Cyrus of Alexandria, and approved by Sergius of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, and Paul, who taught that there is in our Lord Jesus Christ but one operation of the divinity and humanity. Session I. Oct. 5.

In the second session the petition of Stephen, bishop of Doria, was read. Several Greek abbots, priests, and monks, who were at Rome, came forward and demanded that the type or formulary of Constans [4] should be anathematized, in which they declared that the Lord Jesus Christ was represented as being without operation and without will, in fact, without a soul. Session II. Oct. 8.

In the third session the writings of the accused parties were produced, and amongst others the book of Theodorus, bishop of Pharan, in which he taught the doctrine of one operation only, asserting the Divine Word to be the source, and the humanity only the instrument. Session III. Oct. 17.

S. Martin refuted these errors, and showed with exactness the meaning of the term "theandric operation [5]," which he said implied plainly two operations of

[4] An edict published by the emperor Constans, in 648, by the advice of Paul of Constantinople, in which all parties were enjoined to observe strict silence upon the subject.

[5] "Operatio Deivirilis."

one person; and he stated that S. Dionysius had used it only to express the union of them in one and the same person, adding that the property of that union is to perform *humanly* divine actions, *divinely* human actions.

Session IV. Oct. 19. In the fourth session the definitions of the five œcumenical councils upon the subject were read, and the type of Constans examined and condemned.

Session V. Oct. 31. In the fifth the passages from the fathers relating to the matter were read; the tricks and shifts of the Monothelites were exposed, and the Catholic doctrine soundly and luminously set forth. The Ecthesis of Heraclius [6] was condemned as impious.

The council, after having cited a large number of passages gathered from the fathers, pronounced its judgment in twenty canons, in which it condemns all who do not confess in our Lord Jesus Christ two wills and two operations.

The acts of this council were transmitted by S. Martin to all Catholic bishops, with a synodical epistle addressed to all the faithful. The council was received every where with the five œcumenical councils.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 75.

Lateran, 1105. LATERAN. Held in Lent, 1105. Pascal II. excommunicated in this council the count de Meulan and his confederates, who were accused of confirming and encouraging the king of England in his conduct concerning the investitures. It was also probably in this council that Pascal reprimanded Bruno of Treves for having received investiture at the hands of the emperor Henry. It does not appear that the pope complained of Bruno's attachment to Henry, excommunicated though the latter was; this, amongst other examples, shows that men were not esteemed worse Catholics, even by the holy see, for not executing in all their rigour the judgments pronounced against heresy; in other words, that the pope's power in temporal matters was at that time by no means an article of faith, but in order to be a good Catholic it needed only to obey the pope in spiritual and the king in temporal matters.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 741.

Lateran, 1112. LATERAN. A numerous council was held on the

[6] In 639, the emperor Heraclius promulgated an edict, composed by Sergius of Constantinople, and called the Ecthesis, or exposition of faith, by which all controversies upon the subject of the two wills in Jesus Christ were strictly forbidden, though the edict itself plainly recognized but one will.

28th March, 1112, composed of about one hundred bishops, several abbots, and an innumerable multitude of other clergy and of laymen. Pascal II. here revoked the right of investiture which the emperor Henry V. had the year before forced him, whilst a prisoner, to grant to him. He also cleared himself from the suspicion of heresy, which some had attempted to fix upon him, by making open confession of his faith before the council, The emperor was excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 767.

Lateran, 1116.

LATERAN. Held March 6th, 1116. In this council Pascal II. again revoked the privilege which the emperor had extorted from him, under a perpetual anathema; the emperor himself was not excommunicated in this council, but the acts of the several councils held by the pope's legates, in which this sentence had been passed upon him, were approved; the prohibition to give or receive investiture was renewed.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 806, and Appendix, 1834.

Lateran, 1123, falselystyled Ninth Œcumenical.

LATERAN. Held in 1123, March 25, under Calixtus II., and composed of more than three hundred bishops and six hundred abbots; the ambassadors of the emperor Henry were also present.

For the sake of peace it was agreed that the emperor should no longer give investiture by ring and staff, but that the bishop or abbot, having been freely elected, should receive from him only the investiture of the fief, by the baton or sceptre. The indulgence granted by Urban II. to those who proceeded to the assistance of the Christians oppressed by the infidels, was renewed, and twenty-two canons were published.

1. Forbids simony.

3. Forbids the clergy to have wives, to keep mistresses, or to live with any women, except as specified by the canon of Nicea.

4. Forbids princes, and any of the laity, to take upon themselves to dispose of Church property.

7. Forbids all persons to give a cure of souls or prebend without the bishop's consent.

9. Forbids to receive into communion persons who have been excommunicated by their own bishop.

10. Forbids to consecrate a bishop elected uncanonically.

11. Grants indulgences to those who should assume the cross for the Holy Land; places their persons, pro-

perty, and families under the protection of the blessed apostle S. Peter and the holy Roman Church; enjoins all who, after having assumed the cross, either for the Holy Land or for Spain, have laid it aside, to resume it and to begin their voyage within the year, under pain of excommunication, and, if the offenders be princes or lords, of having their lands placed under an interdict.

14. Forbids the laity, under pain of excommunication, to appropriate to their own use offerings made to the Church, and to shut up the approaches to churches (*ecclesias incastellari*).

15 and 16. Excommunicate those who made or passed bad money, and who pillaged pilgrims.

17. Forbids abbots and monks to administer penance publicly, to visit the sick, to administer extreme unction, or to sing solemn and public masses; it also enjoins them to receive from their bishop the holy chrism and oils, and their orders.

19. Orders that monasteries shall continue to render to the bishops the same services and dues as have been rendered since the time of Gregory VII.

21. Declares the marriages of priests, deacons, subdeacons, and monks, to be null and void.

22. Declares all alienations of Church property, and all orders conferred by intruding bishops, simoniacally obtained, or not conferred according to the canons, to be null and void.

None but bishops of the Latin Church were summoned to this council, nor have its decrees ever been received in the east as œcumenical.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 891.

Lateran, 1139, falsely styled Tenth Œcumenical.

LATERAN. Convened by pope Innocentius II., who presided at it, in 1139 (April 2). About one thousand prelates (i. e. archbishops, bishops, and abbots) were present[7]. In this council the anti-pope Peter (Anacletus II.) and Arnold of Brescia were condemned; the last, who was a disciple of Abelard, for his violent declamations against the pope, the bishops, the clergy, and the monks. Certain bishops, who had been schismatically ordained by Anacletus, were deposed; the

[7] Amongst them were five English bishops, viz. Theobald of Canterbury, Ernulphus of Rochester, Simon of Winchester, Roger of Coventry, and Robert of Exeter; also four abbots, who went as the representatives of the other bishops and the abbots of England.

pope calling them by name, and taking from them the crozier, ring, and pall, after having addressed them upon the grievousness of their fault. Thirty canons of discipline were published. Lateran, 1139.

1 and 2. Deprive all ecclesiastics simoniacally ordained.

3. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to receive those who have been excommunicated by their bishop.

4. Directs that ecclesiastics who, after monition from their bishop, do not reform their costume, and dress decently, shall be deprived of their benefices.

6. Is directed against the marriage and concubinage of sub-deacons.

7. Forbids to hear mass celebrated by a married priest, or by one living with a mistress; and declares the marriages of priests, as well as those of monks and canons, to be null and void, and orders them to separate from their wives.

9. Forbids regular canons and monks to learn civil law or medicine, for profit, and excommunicates bishops, abbots, and priors, who give them permission to do so.

10. Orders lay-persons possessed of Church-tithes, to restore them to the bishop under pain of excommunication; and warns them that they are guilty of sacrilege, and liable to eternal damnation.

11 and 12. Relate to the Trève de Dieu.

13. Condemns usury.

14. Forbids tournaments and military combats, and orders that persons killed in such melées, be denied Christian burial [8].

15. Excommunicates, without permitting the bishops to absolve them, persons who maltreat clerks or monks: also forbids to touch those who have sought an asylum within a church or in a churchyard, under pain of excommunication.

18 and 19. Relate to incendiaries and their abettors, whom they sentence to excommunication, and to go to the Holy Land or to Spain to serve the cause of the Church.

[8] "Detestabiles autem illas nundinas vel ferias, in quibus milites e condicto convenire solent, et ad ostentationem virium suarum et audaciæ temerariæ congrediuntur, unde mortes hominum et animarum pericula sæpe proveniunt, omni modo fieri interdicimus. Quod si quis eorum ibidem mortuus fuerit, quamvis ei poscenti pœnitentia et viaticum non negetur, Ecclesiasticâ tamen careat sepulturâ."

21. Forbids to confer holy orders upon the sons of priests, except they bind themselves to a monastic or regular life.

23. Condemns the heresy of the Manichæans[9].

27. Forbids nuns to be present in the same choir with the monks and canons, at the chaunting of the holy office.

28. Directs that no bishopric shall be permitted to remain vacant for more than three months.

29. Anathematizes slingers and archers who exercise their profession against Christians.

30. Annuls all the ordinations made by Peter of Leon (Anacletus II.), and other heretics and schismatics.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 999.

This council has no title to be considered as œcumenical, for the reasons mentioned in the last.

Lateran, 1179, falsely styled Eleventh Œcumenical.

LATERAN. Held March 2, 1179, under pope Alexander III., who presided, at the head of two hundred and eighty bishops, collected from many countries: from the East a few *Latin* bishops, with the abbot Nectarius, attended, but none from the orthodox eastern Churches. The object of the council was to correct abuses which had sprung up during the long schism, then just brought to a close by the treaty of peace between Alexander and the emperor Frederic, at Venice, in 1177. It consisted of three sessions; the first March 5, the second March 14, and the third March 19. Twenty-seven canons were published, of which the following are the chief.

1. Declares that from that time the election of the pope should be confined to the college of cardinals, and that two-thirds of the votes should be required to make a lawful election, instead of a majority only as heretofore.

3. Directs that a person to be elected to a bishopric, shall be not less than thirty years of age, legitimate by birth, and well spoken of as to learning and morality; also that no benefice, having cure of souls, shall be given to an ecclesiastic under twenty-five years of age.

4. Regulates the number of horses, &c., which a prelate might take with him, when visiting his diocese; allows the archbishop forty or fifty, cardinals twenty-five, bishops twenty or thirty, &c.

[9] The followers of Peter de Bruis.

7. Forbids any fee to be taken for inducting to a living, burying the dead, blessing the newly married, or administering the sacraments. Lateran, 1179.

8. Forbids to present to, or even to promise, benefices before they are vacant; and directs collators to present within six months after vacancy.

9. Forbids the Knights Templars and other fraternities to receive tithes, churches, &c., from any lay hand, without the authority of the bishop: to receive excommunicated persons, &c.

10. Forbids to receive monks into monasteries for money; forbids monks to possess property under pain of excommunication.

11. Forbids ecclesiastics to retain women in their houses, and to frequent nunneries, without necessary cause.

13 and 14. Forbid pluralities, and order residence.

15. Orders that the property of ecclesiastics, saved out of their church-preferment, shall, at their death, go to the particular church they have served, whether they have otherwise disposed of it by will or not.

18. Orders the appointment of a school-master in all cathedral churches, who may instruct the youth and the poor clergy.

20. Condemns tournaments, &c.

21. Enjoins, under pain of excommunication, the observation of the "Trève de Dieu" (Treuga Domini).

23. Grants to lepers the privilege of having a church, churchyard, and priest, where they are in sufficient numbers to demand it, and provided they do not injure the parochial rights of the mother-church.

24. Excommunicates those who in any way assist the Saracens with weapons, &c.; and also those who make away with the property of shipwrecked persons.

25. Directs that usurers shall be shut out from communion during life, and forbidden Christian burial when dead.

27. Is directed against the Albigenses.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1503.

This council was not œcumenical in its convocation, nor was it ever received as such by a large portion of the Catholic Church.

LATERAN. Held 11th November, 1215, in the church of S. Saviour, under pope Innocentius III.; who, in his bull of convocation, declares his reasons for Lateran, 1215, falsely styled Twelfth

Œcumenical. assembling the council, viz. the evils of the Church, and the great depravation of morals, of which he draws a lively picture. The council commenced its sittings on the 11th November, and ended on the 30th of the same month. Four hundred and twelve bishops[1], eight hundred abbots and priors, the ambassadors of many Catholic princes, were present; also two Latin patriarchs from the East, viz. Gervais of Constantinople and the patriarch of Jerusalem.

The pope opened the assembly with a sermon upon S. Luke xxii. 15, relating to the recovery of the Holy Land and the reformation of the Church.

Subsequently seventy chapters, which Innocentius himself had drawn up, relating to the extirpation of heresy, the reform of the Church, peace between Christian princes, the succour of the Holy Land, and the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches, were read. These chapters are to be regarded simply as the constitutions of Innocentius himself, who drew them up; no debate followed upon them, and the silence of the bishops was taken for their assent: not having been made in the council, nor discussed "*conciliariter*," they are, therefore, not entitled to the same respect with synodal canons. They are, indeed, spoken of rather as the decrees of Innocentius than as those of the council of Lateran, and were not published as the canons of Lateran for more than three hundred years afterwards, viz. by Cochlæus in 1538.

Chapter 1. Contains an exposition of the Catholic faith, principally with reference to those sects who still retained the Manichæan heresy: it sets forth that there is but One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who at the first made all things, both spiritual and material, out of nothing, not excepting the devils themselves, who at the first were created good. In order to establish the authority of the Old Testament, which these heretics rejected, it asserts that the same God who at first delivered to mankind the doctrines of salvation by Moses, and the prophets, afterwards more clearly pointed out the way of life by his Son, whom He caused to be born of the Virgin.

It further declares that there is but one universal

[1] Amongst them were the bishops of Moray, Glasgow, and Caithness.

Church, out of which there is no salvation; that there is but one sacrifice, viz. that of the mass; that in it Jesus Christ Himself is both the Priest and the Victim; that "his Body and Blood, in the sacrament of the altar, are truly contained under the species of bread and wine; the bread being, by the Divine Omnipotence, *transubstantiated* into his Body, and the wine into his Blood; that for completing the mysterious union between Christ and his Church, we may receive his Human Nature, as he was pleased to take ours[2]." That this sacrament can only be celebrated by a priest, lawfully ordained, in virtue of that ecclesiastical power granted by our Lord to his Apostles and their successors. It then declares the efficacy of baptism, both of infants and adults; and that they who fall after baptism, may be restored by the sacrament of penance. Lateran, 1215.

Chapter 2. Condemns the treatise of the abbot Joachim against Peter Lombard, upon the subject of the blessed Trinity, which encouraged Tritheism; also, it condemns the errors of Amauri.

Chapter 3. Anathematizes all heretics who hold any thing in opposition to the preceding exposition of faith; and enjoins that after condemnation, they shall be delivered over to the secular arm; also excommunicates all who receive, protect, or maintain heretics, and threatens with deposition all bishops who do not use their utmost endeavours to clear their dioceses of them.

Chapter 4. Exhorts the Greeks to unite with, and conform to, the Roman Church.

Chapter 5. Regulates the order of precedence of the patriarchs:—1. Rome. 2. Constantinople. 3. Alexandria. 4. Antioch. 5. Jerusalem. And permits these several patriarchs to give the pall to the archbishops of their dependencies, exacting from themselves a profession of faith, and of obedience to the Roman see when they receive the pall from the pope.

Chapter 6. Enjoins ordinaries to be careful in reforming their clergy.

Chapter 7. Orders that provincial councils be held every year.

[2] This is the first appearance of a synodical authorization of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and indeed, considering that these constitutions were not the work of the council, but of Innocentius alone, the doctrine can hardly be said to have had the sanction of this council.

Lateran, 1215.

Chapter 8. Regulates the manner of proceeding against ecclesiastics.

Chapter 9. Orders bishops to provide that all in their dioceses shall use the same rites.

Chapter 10. Directs that bishops shall be careful to provide the churches of their dioceses with persons capable of preaching the word of God.

Chapter 11. Confirms and extends the canon of the council of Lateran (1179), which provides for a schoolmaster in every cathedral church, to teach the poor clerks and others.

Chapter 12. Enjoins that abbots and priors shall hold chapters every three years, without prejudice to the rights of the bishops of the dioceses.

Chapter 13. Forbids the establishment of new religious orders; also forbids an abbot to preside over more than one religious house.

Chapters 14, 15, and 16. Forbid to the clergy incontinence, drunkenness, hunting, keeping sporting dogs or birds, secular pursuits, attendance at plays or farces, and frequenting of taverns (excepting when travelling); also orders propriety of apparel, and the tonsure suitable to their rank.

Chapter 17. Forbids feasting.

Chapter 18. Forbids the clergy to be present at the execution of criminals, to pronounce any judgment tending to the shedding of blood, to fight duels, and to give the blessing for the ordeal by hot or cold water, or hot iron.

Chapter 19 and 20. Relate to churches and their proper vessels, order that chrisms be kept locked up.

Chapter 21 [3]. Enjoins all the faithful of both sexes, having arrived at years of discretion, to confess all their sins at least once a year to their proper priest, and to communicate at Easter.

Chapter 22. Orders all medical persons to warn the sick to send for the priest before prescribing for them.

Chapter 23. Orders that no cathedral nor regular

[3] This is the celebrated canon known (from the words with which it commences) as the canon "*Omnis utriusque sexûs.*" It also adds, that confession may be made to any other priest with the consent of the parish priest. This is the first canon known which orders generally sacramental confession. Probably the doctrine of the Albigenses—that neither confession nor satisfaction were requisite in order to obtain remission of sin—led to its enactment.

church shall remain vacant more than three months, after which time the right of presentation to lapse to the immediate superior. Lateran, 1215.

Chapters 24, 25, and 26, relate to elections.

Chapter 27. Forbids to ordain illiterate persons.

Chapter 28. Declares that they who have asked leave to resign their benefices, shall be compelled to do so.

Chapter 29. Confirms the canon of the third council of Lateran, which forbids pluralities.

Chapter 30. Forbids to give benefices to incapable persons.

Chapter 31. Excludes bastards from benefices.

Chapter 32. Orders patrons to find a sufficient maintenance for the curates.

Chapters 33 and 34. Restrict episcopal and archidiaconal procurations when in visitations.

Chapters 35 to 44. Relate to appeals, the procedure of ecclesiastical judges, &c.

Chapters 45 and 46. Provide for the discharge of the goods and persons belonging to the Church.

Chapters 47 and 48. Regulate the form of excommunication.

Chapter 49. Regulates that of recusancy.

Chapters 50, 51, and 52. Relate to matrimonial impediments, &c.

Chapters 53, 54, 55, and 56. Provide for the preserving and enjoying of the tenths, even upon monks' lands.

Chapter 57. Restrains the privilege of regulars being always buried in holy ground.

Chapter 58. Allows the clergy and monks to celebrate divine service in their churches in a low voice during an interdict, providing that no bells be rung and no excommunicated or interdicted persons be allowed to be present.

Chapter 59. Forbids the religious to borrow or to become sureties without the abbot's leave.

Chapter 60. Restrains the encroachments of abbots.

Chapter 61. Confirms the twenty-fifth canon of the council general of Lateran (1139).

Chapter 62. Forbids to exhibit relics already recognized out of their case, (extra capsam,) to sell them, and to honour new ones except they be first approved by the pope.

Chapters 63, 64, and 65. Abolish certain abuses.

Lateran, 1215.

Chapter 66. Forbids all fees for burials, marriage blessings, &c., without prejudice, however, to existing customs and pious usages.

Chapter 67. Is directed against the excessive usuries of the Jews.

Chapter 68. Directs that Saracens and Jews shall wear a peculiar kind of dress, to distinguish them from Christians, and orders princes to take measures to hinder the utterance of blasphemies against our Lord Jesus Christ.

Chapter 69. Forbids to give any public office or situation to Jews and Saracens.

Chapter 70. Directs that converted Jews be prevented from observing Jewish ceremonies.

After these canons of Innocentius had been read, the council proceeded to publish a decree for the crusade to the Holy Land, in which the time of rendezvous was fixed for the first day of June, and the place Sicily.

Whilst treating of the question of the Albigenses, the affairs of Raymond, count of Toulouse, were discussed.

The count himself appeared, accompanied by his son and the count de Foix, to demand the restitution of his lands, which had been taken from him by the crusaders. His request was refused, and his territory declared to be alienated from him for ever. His wife, however, was permitted, on account of the high reputation which she enjoyed, to retain the lands forming her dowry. Lastly, in this council the union of the Maronites with the Roman Church was discussed; Jeremiah, or Jonah, their patriarch being present.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 117.

Lateran, 1512, falsely styled Œcumenical.

LATERAN. Held in 1512, under Julius II. This council held its first session on the 10th day of May, 1512, and was dissolved on the 16th March, 1517, under pope Leo X.

The opening was made May 3rd, the pope presiding at the head of fifteen cardinals, eighty Italian archbishops and bishops, and six abbots or generals of orders.

Session I. May 10.

In the first session the eleventh canon of Toledo was read, enjoining modesty, silence, and union in all ecclesiastical synods. The officers of the council were named.

Session II. May 17.

The bull of convocation having been read, Cajetan, general of the Dominicans, spoke against the council of Pisa, and an edict was promulgated annulling all its

acts; also an edict postponing the third session to December, to allow time for the arrival of the bishop of Guerk on the part of the emperor. Lateran, 1512.

The third session was held on the 3rd of December. The pope renewed his bull annulling all the acts of the councils of Pisa and Milan, and placed the kingdom of France under an interdict. The bishop of Guerk, on the part of the emperor, declared his approval of the council; about one hundred and twenty prelates attended this session. Session III. Dec. 3.

The letters patent were read, which Louis XI. of France had formerly addressed to Pius II., by which the Pragmatic sanction was abrogated; by a bull its supporters were cited to appear before the council within sixty days, to show their reasons for opposing its abrogation. By another bull the council declared the abrogation of the Pragmatic sanction. Session IV. Dec. 10.

The pope being seized by illness, cardinal S. George, bishop of Ostia, presided. A new citation to the same parties, for the purpose mentioned above, was decreed. Session V. Feb. 16, 1513.

Pope Julius being dead, his successor, Leo X., presided, who declared himself unwilling that the above citation should be carried into effect, and desired that all peaceable means should be first tried. Seson VI April 27.

In the interval between this and the following session, ambassadors arrived from Louis XII., declaring, in his name, that he would renounce the council of Pisa, and adhere to that of Lateran, upon condition that the cardinals who had been degraded should be re-established, and the acts directed against his kingdom annulled.

The letters of the cardinal Bernadin, of Carvajal, and Frederick, cardinal of St. Severin, were read, in which they renounced the schism, condemned all the acts of the council of Pisa, approved those of Lateran, promised to obey Leo, and acknowledged that Julius had justly deposed them from their rank of cardinal; upon which they were restored to their office. Session VII. June 17.

The pope presided; twenty-five cardinals and one hundred and twenty-two prelates attended. The act of Louis XII. was presented by his ambassador, by which he declared his adhesion to the present council of Lateran, and revoked his approval of that of Pisa. VIII. Dec. 19.

A petition having been presented against the parliament of Provence, accusing that assembly of interfering with the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, and of

Lateran, 1512. setting itself up against the pope's authority, a monitory letter was issued to the members of that parliament, requiring them to appear before the council within three months.

3. A decree was read directed against certain philosophers, who taught that the reasonable soul was mortal; and against others, who, allowing the immortality of the soul, asserted that there was but *one* soul pervading all human bodies.

4. It was ordered that no persons in holy orders should employ more than five years in the study of philosophy, without, at the same time, applying themselves to theology and the canon law, in order to correct the ill effects of such reading upon their mind.

5. Three bulls were published: 1. Exhorting to peace and unity amongst Christian princes. 2. Addressed to the Bohemians, and offering them a safe-conduct to induce them to come to the council. 3. Directed against the exactions of the officers of the court of Rome, and relating to the reformation of the Church.

Session IX. May 5, 1514. In the ninth session an act of the French prelates, signed by five bishops, was read, in which they excused themselves for not attending the council, and renounced the council of Pisa; besides this, a long decree was read, concerning the reformation of the court of Rome.

Session X. May 4, 1515. The next session did not take place until the 4th of May in the following year. The pope presided; and twenty-three cardinals, together with several archbishops, bishops, abbots, and doctors, were present. Four decrees were read—1. Approving of the "Monts de Piété," established in Italy and elsewhere; which were public offices, where money was lent for a specified time to persons in need, upon security of property deposited at the office, which property was sold when the time allowed had expired. 2. Relates to the clergy, and ordered that the commissioners of the holy see should punish those exempted chapters, which availed themselves of their privilege to commit irregularities with impunity; it also gave permission to the bishop of the diocese to visit once a year nunneries under the immediate control of the holy see. 3. Orders that all books printed at Rome, should be submitted to the revision of the pope's vicar and the master of the palace; and that those printed in other places, should be examined by the bishop of the diocese, or by some

one appointed by him. 4. Relates to the Pragmatic sanction. Lateran, 1512.

In the eleventh session the Maronites were admitted to the pope's obedience; and a confession of faith was read before the council, in which they recognized the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, &c. Session XI. Dec. 19, 1516.

Then the celebrated bull was read, which substituted for the Pragmatic sanction, the Concordat made between Leo X. and the king of France, Francis I., at Bologna. Several of the articles of the Pragmatic were retained, but most of them were altered, and some abolished altogether.

Article 1 was entirely contrary to the Pragmatic; the latter had re-established the right of election; the Concordat, on the contrary, declares that the chapters of cathedrals in France shall no longer proceed to elect in case of vacancy, but that the king shall name to the pope, within six months, a doctor or licentiate in theology, of at least twenty-seven years of age, whom the pope shall nominate to the vacant see; and that in case of the king's persisting in the appointment of an improper person, the right of appointing shall lapse to the pope.

By this article the pope reserved to himself the right of appointing directly to bishoprics vacant "*in curiâ*" (i. e. becoming vacant by the death of the possessor whilst at Rome).

2. Declares the abolition of all expective graces and reservation of benefices. See C. Basle.

3. Defends the rights of graduates, and enacts that all benefices falling vacant during four months in each year, shall be given to graduates. It also fixes the period of study necessary for attaining to the several degrees, viz. ten years for that of doctor or licentiate in theology; seven years for that of doctor or licentiate in canon or civil law, or for the degree of M.D.; five years for that of master or licentiate in arts; six for that of B.D.; and five for that of bachelor in civil or canon law. For noblemen three years only are required.

4. Gives to the pope, where a patron has ten benefices, the right of presenting to one of them; when he has fifty, to two; provided that they be not two prebends in the same Church.

Lateran, 1512.

5. Relates to suits and appeals, and resembles the regulation made in the Pragmatic; it declares that all suits shall be terminated on the spot by those judges who have the right, either by prescription or privilege, to take cognizance of them, excepting in certain cases, and forbids to appeal to the highest authority, "*omisso medio*."

The four articles following are the same with those upon the like subjects in the Pragmatic, viz. these :—

6. Upon peaceable possession.
7. Upon concubinage amongst the clergy.
8. Upon intercourse with the excommunicated.
9. Upon interdicts.
10. On the decree "*Sublatione Clementinæ Litteris.*"

No mention is made in the Concordat of the articles in the Pragmatic, concerning the annates and the number of cardinals.

Subsequently the decree abolishing the Pragmatic sanction was read in the council, and was received by all but the bishop of Tortona in Lombardy, who had the courage to oppose it; saying, that the respect due to the council of Basle and the assembly at Bourges, ought to hinder them from touching upon a subject of such importance.

The opposition which the Concordat received from the parliament, the universities, and the Church at Paris, is well-known, as well as the disputes and divisions which its execution occasioned.

In this session, moreover, was read the bull relating to monastic privileges, by which the pope granted to all ordinaries the right of visiting all parish-churches in the hands of the regulars, and of celebrating mass in them; also the right of examining monks to be employed in the ministry. It also declared that those persons who should confess to monks approved by the ordinary, should be considered to have satisfied the canon "Omnis utriusque sexus [4]."

[4] The business of the council through the last three or four sessions was greatly hindered, and much delay caused, by the complaints brought by the bishops against the cardinals and monks; the former they accused of exalting themselves unduly at the expence of the episcopate, and of lording it over the bishops. So far was this quarrel carried, that the whole of the bishops came to the determination, previous to the ninth session, either to refuse to attend the council or to negative every proposition, until their grievances had been redressed. This disagree-

The last session was held on the 16th March, 1517. The Latin patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Aquilæa, eighteen cardinals and eighty-six archbishops, being present. A bull was published, confirming all the acts of the preceding sessions, and granting a subsidy of a tenth on all ecclesiastical property in aid of the war against the Turks.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 1—346. *L'Hist. de la Prag. S. et Concordat, par Pithon.*

Lateran, 1512. Session XII. March 6, 1517.

LAUSANNE. [*Concilium Lausanense.*] Held in 1449. Felix V., who had been elected to the pontificate by the fathers at Basle, having renounced the popedom, April 9, 1449, they re-assembled at Lausanne, in continuation of the council of Basle. Here they ratified by two decrees his resignation, with all the clauses and conditions which had been agreed on between himself and Nicholas V. The pope, on his side, by a bull given at Spoleto, June 18, declared that God having restored peace to the Church, and his venerable and very dear brother Amadeus, premier cardinal of the Roman Church, known as Felix V., in his obedience, having renounced all claims to the sovereign pontificate, and those who had assembled at Basle, and afterwards at Lausanne, under the style of an œcumenical council, having decreed and published that Nicholas V. should be thenceforth obeyed as the sole and indubitable pontiff; and having at length dissolved the aforesaid council of Basle, therefore, continues the pope, wishing, as far as God gives us the power, to procure peace amongst all the faithful, we do ourselves approve the same, and for the good and the unity of the Church, of our plenary apostolic power, with the counsel and consent of our brethren, we do ratify and confirm all elections, confirmations, provisions, and benefices whatever . . . . made or given on account of persons, and in places in the obedience of Felix V., and those who were assembled at Basle and Lausanne, as well as all that the ordinaries may have done by their authority.

Lausanne, 1449.

By a second bull Nicholas re-established all persons of whatsoever state or condition, who had been deprived

ment was partially healed by the bull published in the ninth session. The complaint made against the monks related to their exorbitant privileges, which tended to bring the episcopal office into contempt, and, indeed, to render it useless. This gave rise to the bull mentioned above.

of their benefices or jurisdiction by pope Eugenius, on account of their adherence to Felix and the council of Basle. And again, in a third bull, he declares all that had been said or written against Felix or the council of Basle, to be null and void.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1335.

Lavaur, 1213.

LAVAUR. [*Concilium Vaurense.*] Held at Lavaur, in Languedoc, in 1213, by the archbishop of Narbonne, legate, to consider the demand of Peter, king of Arragon, that the lands taken from Raymond, count of Toulouse, and the counts of Foix and Comminges, should be restored to them. The decision of the council was against the demand.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 81.

Lavaur, 1368.

LAVAUR. Held July 6, 1368; Peter, archbishop of Narbonne, presiding, at the head of thirteen bishops. They published one hundred and thirty-three canons, a great part of which are taken from the acts of the councils of Avignon in 1326 and 1337. Amongst other things, it is ordered that every priest saying mass in his church, shall be attended by at least one other clerk in a surplice; that every collegiate and cathedral church shall send two of its body to study in canon law or theology, who shall not by such absence be deprived of their share of the distributions. Many of the other articles relate to the temporalities of the Church, her rights and jurisdiction, &c.

The second and six following articles relate to the order and ceremonies to be observed in the celebration of the provincial councils.

In the 90th canon, all clerks are warned to abstain from flesh on Saturdays, in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary.

By canons 123, 124, indulgences were granted to those who attended the mass of the blessed Virgin on Saturdays, who prayed for the pope. An indulgence was also granted to such persons as contributed to the Church of Lavaur.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1957.

Leon, in Spain, 1012.

LEON (in Spain). [*Concilium Legionense.*] Convoked by king Alphonso V. and his wife, who were present. Forty-seven statutes were drawn up, seven only of which relate to ecclesiastical subjects. The first of these orders that causes and other matters relating to the Church shall be discussed first in councils. These councils were, strictly speaking, mixed assemblies, in which both spiritual and temporal matters were transacted.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 817.

LEON (in Spain). Held in 1091, by Regnier, cardinal and legate for Spain, and Bernard, metropolitan of Toledo. Various regulations relating to the rites and offices of the Church were made; amongst others, it was ordered that divine service should be celebrated throughout Spain, according to the use of S. Isidore, and that all ecclesiastical acts should thenceforth be written in the Gallic character instead of the Gothic, which was in use at Toledo.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 482. Leon, in Spain, 1091.

LERIDA. [*Concilium Ilerdense.*] Convoked in 524, by Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths; eight bishops were present, who published sixteen canons. Lerida, 524.

1. Suspends and deprives for two years ecclesiastics who shed human blood under any pretext whatever: assigns them two years of penitence, and forbids their elevation to any higher order.

2. Assigns seven years penitence to adulterers: if clerks, deprives them for ever of exercising their functions.

3. Renews the canons of Agde and Orleans, concerning monks.

4. Forbids persons living in incest to remain in church after the dismissal of Catechumens; forbids Christians to eat with them.

8. Deprives of their rank, until they should have done penance, those of the clergy who have seized or ill-used their slaves, who have fled to a church for asylum.

9. Following the canon of Nicea, assigns seven years of penance among the Catechumens, and two years amongst the faithful, to those who had been re-baptized in heresy.

13. Rejects the offerings made by Catholics who suffer their children to be baptized by heretics.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1610.

LILLE. [*Concilium Insulanum.*] A council was held at Lille, in Provençe, in 1251, by Jean de Beaux, archbishop of Arles, and his suffragans, in which thirteen canons of discipline were drawn up; amongst which, Lille, 1251.

1. Orders the frequent preaching of the Catholic faith.

3. Makes over to the bishop the property of heretics.

6. Directs persons to make their wills in the presence of the parish priest (probably to hinder them from benefiting the cause of the heretics by legacies).

13. Forbids clandestine marriages.—Tom. xi. Conc. Appen. 2348.

Lille, 1288. LILLE. Held in 1288, by Rostang, archbishop of Arles, and his suffragans. Eighteen canons were published, of which the first thirteen are but a repetition of those of the preceding council.

14. Is directed against those who give poisons or drugs to procure abortion.

15. Forbids to carry wheat before the tithe be paid.

17. Directs that in order to hinder the great expense ordinarily made at baptism, by which many persons were induced to leave their children unbaptized, (who consequently often died without that sacrament), it should not be lawful in future to give any thing beyond the white dress or albe.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1335.

Lillebonne, 1080. LILLEBONNE. [*Concilium Juliobonense.*] Held at Whitsuntide, in 1080, by order and in the presence of William the Conqueror. William, archbishop of Rouen, presided, at the head of the bishops and abbots of Normandy. Thirteen canons were published; they enforce the observance of the Trève de Dieu; order that if a church be given to any monastery, a sufficient allowance shall be provided out of the revenue for a priest, and the proper celebration of divine service; inflict penalties upon those who marry their relations, upon persons guilty of simony, &c. &c.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 391. *Bessin in Conc. Normaniæ.*

Lima, in Peru, 1583. LIMA (in Peru). A council was held at Lima in 1583, under the archbishop Mögroveyo. Several canons of discipline were published. At the same time a certain professor of theology was condemned, who, allowing himself to be deceived by a woman whom he believed to be possessed, declared that he was visited by a familiar angel, who told him all things; that he had often conversed with the Almighty, that he should be pope, and would transfer the holy see to Peru.—*Acosta*, l. 2, *de noviss.* c. 2.

Limoges, 1029. LIMOGES. [*Concilium Lemovicense.*] Held August 4, 1029, to decide the question whether the title of "apostle" ought to be given to S. Martial of Limoges, as the Limosins desired, or that of "confessor," as others maintained. The decision of the council appears to have been that S. Martial was an apostle[5].—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 860.

[5] S. Martial was the first bishop of Limoges, and was sent into

LIMOGES. Held November 18, 1031, under Aymon de Bourbon, archbishop of Bourges, who presided, upon the same subject. Nine bishops were present. The acts of S. Martial, which at this time passed for genuine, were read, and in them S. Martial was declared to have been baptized by S. Peter, and to have received the Holy Spirit with the apostles on the day of Pentecost. The apostleship of S. Martial was again confirmed. Limoges, 1031.

After this Jordan, bishop of Limoges, made heavy complaints against the great men and the military in this diocese, whereupon the council established the "Trève de Dieu," as had been already done in many other councils. A terrible sentence of excommunication[6] was pronounced against those who would not preserve the peace and act justly, according as the council had prescribed.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 869.

LINLITHGOW. Held by Hamilton, archbishop of S. Andrew's, in 1553, in which all who maintained opinions contrary to the teaching of the Roman Church were condemned, and the decrees of the council of Trent [made during the pontificate of Paul III.] were received. Some acts were also passed for reforming the corrupt lives of the clergy.—*Bishop Skinner, Ecc. Hist. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 40. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 78. Linlithgow, 1553.

LIPTINES or LESTINES. [*Concilium Liptinense.*] Held in 743, by order of Carloman, Bonifacius presiding. Four canons were published. The bishops, earls, and governors promised in this council to observe the decrees of the council of Germany (see C. Germany, A. D. 742). All the clergy, moreover, promised obedience to the ancient canons; the abbots and monks received the order of S. Benedict, and a part of the re- Liptines, or Lestines, 743.

Gaul about the middle of the third century. He preached throughout the provinces of Aquitaine, and especially at Limoges. His legend (or acts), purporting to have been written by Aurelianus, his successor, is a fabrication of the tenth century, and full of falsehoods, as the account of the next council indicates.

[6] "Cursed be they and their abettors; cursed be their arms and their horses; may they be with Cain the murderer of his brother, with Judas the traitor, and with Dathan and Abiram, who went down alive into hell; and may their joy be for ever put out in the sight of the holy angels, even as these lights are extinguished before your eyes, unless before their death they make satisfaction and due penance," &c. Upon this all the bishops and priests present cast down upon the ground the lighted tapers which they had in their hands.

venue of the Church was assigned for a time to the prince, to enable him to carry on the wars then raging. Mansi gives 744 as the date of this council.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1537.

Lombez, 1176. LOMBEZ. [*Concilium Lumberiense.*] Held at Lombez, probably in the diocese of Alby in Languedoc, in 1176, by the archbishop of Narbonne, against the sect called "Bonshommes" [*boni homines*], who were Manichæans.—*Dom Vaissette Hist. de Languedoc*, t. 3, l. 19, No. 1 and note. Tom. x. Conc. p. 1470.

London, 948. LONDON. [*Concilium Londinense.*] Held September 8, 948. Turquetel was here made abbot of Croyland, after having refused two bishopricks, which the king had offered him. The act is subscribed by two archbishops, four bishops, and two abbots, one of whom was St. Dunstan.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 217.

London, 971 (or 970). LONDON. Held in 971. King Edgar here confirmed the privileges granted to the abbey of Glastonbury, reserving, however, to himself and his successors the power of conferring the pastoral staff upon the elect brother who might be chosen abbot.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 256.

London, 1065. LONDON. Held in 1065, in presence of S. Edward the Confessor, who herein granted full immunities to the abbey of Westminster. The charter was subscribed by the king, queen, two archbishops, ten bishops, and five abbots, on the 28th December, 1066, the year beginning at Christmas.—*Pagi. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 316.

London, 1075. LONDON. A national council was held in the church of S. Paul, at London, in the year 1075, Lanfranc of Canterbury presiding. Thomas, archbishop of York, William of London, Wakelin of Winchester, Herman of Sherbourn, Wulstan of Worcester, Walter of Hereford, Giso of Wells, Remigius of Dorchester (or Lincoln), Herfast of Helman (or Norwich), Stigand of Selsea, Osbourn of Exeter, and Peter of Lichfield, were present; the bishop of Durham was alone absent, having a canonical excuse, the see of Rochester being at the time vacant. Besides these English bishops, Goisford, bishop of Constance, was present, and having large possessions in England, was permitted to sit with them. Many abbots and other religious also attended. Nine fresh canons were published, and many of those enacted in former councils renewed.

1. Ordains, in accordance with the decree of Milevi, Braga, and the fourth of Toledo (A. D. 633), that Bishops shall take precedence according to the date of their consecration, unless privilege of precedence belongs to their sees by ancient custom. It was also decreed that the archbishop of York should sit on the archbishop of Canterbury's right hand, the bishop of London on his left; Winchester next to York, but if the archbishop of York were absent, London should take his place, and the bishop of Winchester sit on the archbishop of Canterbury's left.

2. Orders monks to observe their order, according to the rule of S. Benedict and the dialogue of S. Gregory; forbids them, under heavy penalties, to have any thing of their own.

3. By royal favour, and the authority of the synod, leave was granted to three bishops to remove from villages to cities, viz. Herman from Sherbourn to Salisbury, Stigand from Selsea to Chichester, and Peter from Lichfield to Chester.

4. Orders that no one shall ordain or receive a clerk or monk not belonging to him, without letters commendatory.

5. Permits no one, except the bishops and abbots, to speak in council without the licence of the metropolitan.

6. Forbids to marry any one of kin, or any of the kindred of a deceased wife.

7. Forbids simony.

8. Forbids to hang up the bones of dead animals to drive away pestilence from cattle, forbids sorcery, divinations, and other works of the devil.

9. Forbids any bishop, abbot, or clergyman, to sit as judge in a cause implicating the life or limbs of the accused.

These canons were subscribed by fourteen archbishops and bishops, twenty-one abbots, and the archdeacon of Canterbury.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canons. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 363. Tom. x. Conc. p. 346.

London, 1107.

LONDON. Held in August, 1107, upon the subject of investitures. After long disputes between the king Henry I. and Anselm, the king finding that the pope was against him, assembled all the bishops, abbots, and great men at London, where the dispute was compromised by the two following articles:

1. That for the future none be invested by the king or any lay hand, in any bishoprick or abbey, by delivering the pastoral staff or ring.

2. None elected to any prelacy to be denied consecration on account of homage done to the king.

The king is also said at the same time to have promised in future to deliver vacant bishopricks and abbeys forthwith to the successors; also the dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York concerning the primacy was again settled for a time, Giraud of York swearing subjection to Anselm.—*Johnson's Ecc. Can.* MCVII. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 386.

London, 1108. LONDON. Held May 24, 1108, by Anselm of Canterbury, Thomas the elect of York and all the bishops of England being present, with the king Henry I. and his barons. Ten canons were published.

1. Forbids priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, to keep any women in their houses, except such as are nearly related, according to the canon of Nicea.

2. Orders those who have kept or taken women since the prohibition at London (1102), and have celebrated mass, wholly to discard them, so as not to meet with them knowingly in any house.

3. Orders that, if they must speak with them, it shall be out of doors and before two witnesses.

4. Orders such as by two or three lawful witnesses or by public report are accused of transgressing this statute, to clear themselves by other witnesses, or they will be deemed guilty.

5. Such priests as choose to live with women to be deprived, put out of the choir, and pronounced infamous.

6. Excommunicates those who without leaving their women celebrate mass, except they reform and give satisfaction within eight days.

7. Makes the above statutes binding upon archdeacons and canons.

8. Archdeacons and deans to swear not to take bribes in order to connive at transgressions of these statutes.

9. Those priests who leave their women, and desire to serve at God's altar, to have vicars to officiate for them during the forty days of penitence, in which they must desist from the exercise of their office.

10. Orders bishops to take away all the moveable effects of such priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and canons as shall offend in future, and also their concubines with

their goods.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 387. *Johnson's Ecc. Canons,* MCVIII.

LONDON. Held in 1136. The wants of the Church and state were discussed in the presence of king Stephen, who by a charter then given made very fair promises to the clergy of the quiet enjoyment of their goods, with the power of disposing of them after their death; he also engaged that vacant sees should be under the guardianship of the clergy, all which promises he soon violated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 991. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 412. London, 1136.

LONDON. Held in 1166. The bishops of England in this council appealed to the pope from the legatine authority and the sentences of S. Thomas of Canterbury, who had fled to France in October 1164. See C. CLARENDON and C. NORTHAMPTON.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 447. London, 1166.

LONDON. Held May 19, 1175, by Richard, the successor of S. Thomas à Becket in the see of Canterbury. Eleven English bishops, with the bishop of S. David's, and four abbots, were present besides the primate. Henry II. and his son also attended, and gave their consent to the acts of the council. Eighteen canons were published, all of which, except the sixth and ninth, are attributed to some pope or council. London, 1175.

1. Every beneficed priest or clerk in holy orders refusing to put away his mistress after three monitions, to be deprived. All clerks under the rank of sub-deacon to keep their wives, unless they separate by mutual consent. Sons not to be instituted into their fathers' benefices unless some one succeed between them.

2. Clerks in holy orders not to eat and drink in taverns (unless compelled by the necessities of a journey), under pain of deposition.

3. Clerks in holy orders to take no part in judgments concerning blood, nor to inflict deprivation of any member. Pronounces anathema against the priest who takes the office of sheriff or reeve.

4. Clerks wearing long hair to be clipped by the archdeacon even against their will; not to indulge in any peculiarity in their clothes or shoes.

5. Orders conferred by foreign bishops upon those who despair of obtaining them from their own bishop, are declared null, and such clerks not to be admitted to the exercise of any ecclesiastical function, under pain of ana-

London, 1175.

thema; the bishop so conferring orders (if under the jurisdiction of Canterbury), to be suspended from conferring that order till he make due satisfaction.

6. Forbids all secular causes concerning blood and corporal punishment to be tried in churches or churchyards.

7. Forbids to demand any thing for orders, chrism, baptism, extreme unction, burial, communion, or the dedication of a church; offerings freely made may be received. The offender to be anathema.

8. No demand to be made for the reception of any monk, canon, or nun, who enters a religious life; the offender to be anathema.

9. Forbids the transfer of a church to another by way of portion, or to take any money from the person presented.

10. Forbids monks and clerks to trade for gain, and laymen to take ecclesiastical benefices to farm.

11. Ecclesiastics not to wear arms, to dress suitably; offenders to be degraded.

12. Vicars who lift themselves up against the parsons, and assume to themselves a parsonage, to be no longer allowed to officiate in the same bishoprick.

13. Enjoins that all who refuse to pay tithes be admonished according to the precept of the pope to yield tithe of grain, wine, fruits of trees, young animals, wool, lamb, butter, cheese, flax, hemp, &c.; offenders to be anathematized. Also in suits between clerks, he that is cast to be condemned in costs.

14. Declares that only ten prefaces are found in the sacred catalogue, viz. 1. For Low Sunday (*albis paschalibus*); 2. Ascension-day; 3. Pentecost; 4. Christmas-day; 5. The Apparition of our Lord[7]; 6. For the Apostles; 7. For the Holy Trinity; 8. For the Cross; 9. For the Lent fast only; 10. For the Blessed Virgin; all further additions forbidden.

15. Forbids to administer the holy eucharist sopped.

16. Forbids to consecrate the holy eucharist in any chalice not made of gold or silver; forbids the bishop to bless a chalice made of tin.

17. Enjoins all the faithful to be married publicly, by receiving the priest's benediction; a priest guilty of

[7] "I do not know what should be meant by the apparition of our Lord, except it be his Epiphany, or else his Transfiguration."—*Wheatly, on the Common Prayer*, chap. vi.

marrying any parties privately to be suspended for three years.

18. Marriage null without mutual consent: boys and girls not to marry until both parties shall have attained the legal and canonical age.

Roger, archbishop of York, refused to be present at this council, but by some of his clergy claimed the right of having his cross borne before him in the province of Canterbury; the claim was disallowed, and an appeal made to Rome.

Moreover, in this council the clergy of the diocese of S. Asaph desired that their bishop Godfrey should be restored to them. He had been driven by the fury of the Welsh to seek a maintenance in England, and was appointed guardian of the vacant abbey of Abingdon. He resigned his see, and a successor was appointed. —*Johnson's Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1175. Tom. x. Conc. p. 1461. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 476.

London, 1185.

LONDON. Held in 1185; in which it was declared to be most convenient and proper that the king, instead of going in person to the Holy Land, should remain at home to defend his own country.—*Hoveden*, quoted by *Henry, Hist. of England*, book iii. chap. ii. sect. 3. (vol. v. p. 407.)

London, 1237.

LONDON. Held in the cathedral of S. Paul, at London, on the 19th, 21st, and 22d of November, 1237, by Otto or Otho, cardinal deacon, legate from pope Gregory IX. This assembly was attended, in spite of the dreary season, and a fearful storm, which terrified both legate and council, by all the bishops of England; Edmund, archbishop of Canterbury, sitting on the legate's right hand, and Walter of York on the left, notwithstanding that the latter had renewed the ancient claims of his see [8].

On the first day the legate himself did not attend, but at the request of the bishops the decrees to be passed were privately submitted to them.

[8] The legate wisely endeavoured to heal this disreputable schism between the two primates, by referring to the position of the figures of the apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, on the right and left side of the cross which was depicted in the middle of the pope's bull. "Between so great saints," he says, "contention has never arisen, for both of them are in co-equal glory." The account of a similar dispute between the archbishops of Armagh and Dublin may be found in Wilkins, Conc. vol. iv. p. 80.

London, 1237. The second day, the legate being present, a prohibition was sent by the king, Henry III. to inhibit the council from enacting any thing against his crown and dignity; then the instrument of Otto's legation was read, as also was a bull for keeping the feasts of S. Edward. Moreover, by the pope's command, the canonization of SS. Francis and Dominic was notified.

The following twenty-nine constitutions were read in the second and third sessions, and approved.

1. Orders the consecration of all cathedral, conventual, and parochial churches, by the diocesan bishop, within two years from the date of their completion; if such places be not so consecrated, no masses to be solemnized in them. No old churches to be pulled down upon any pretence without the bishop's leave. This decree not to apply to little chapels, &c.

2. Forbids to demand any fee for administering the holy sacraments (of which it enumerates seven); directs that all persons entering upon the cure of souls, or priest's orders, be chiefly examined upon the subject of the sacraments, and that the archdeacons at every meeting of their deaneries do instruct the priests principally in these matters.

3. Orders that holy baptism be administered on the Sabbath-days [9] before Easter-day and Whit-sunday, as ordered by the canons; and because a popular delusion had gained ground, by which the people were led to think that some danger would happen to their children if they were baptized on those days, viz. Easter-eve, or that of Pentecost, the priests are ordered to dispel this delusion by frequent preaching, and also to learn themselves carefully, and to explain in the vulgar tongue to their parishioners the form of baptism, in case it should be necessary to baptize any one suddenly without the priest.

4. Orders that priests who demand any fee for penance and the other sacraments shall be deprived.

5. Approves the tenth of Lateran, A.D. 1216, which enacts that bishops shall appoint faithful men in every deanery to act as confessors for the clergy.

6. Forbids to confer orders upon idiots, illegitimates, irregulars, illiterate persons, foreigners, and any without a bonâ fide title; the bishop to make diligent search

[9] That is, the Saturdays.

into these matters, and the names of those which are approved to be set down in writing, and called over at the beginning of ordination, carefully and distinctly; the list itself to be preserved in the bishop's palace or in the cathedral. London, 1237.

7. Reprobates the practice of farming churches, &c.

8 and 9. Upon the same subject.

10. No one under the rank of priest to be admitted to a vicarage, unless he be a deacon ready for ordination at the next Ember week; orders that he shall resign every other benefice with cure of souls, and swear to reside in person; vicars already instituted to cause themselves to be made priests within the year.

11. Declares that some priests have violently and fraudulently obtained possession of benefices, which they coveted, during the lifetime of the real possessors, either by pretending their death when absent, and so getting themselves appointed to their livings, or by violently turning them out of their benefices, and keeping possession by force of arms, &c.; forbids to confer benefices upon any mere report of the death or cession of an absent man, otherwise the prelate to make good all damage to the real possessor.

12. Orders that no one Church be for the future divided into several parsonages or vicarages, and that such as hitherto have been divided be made whole again, as soon as opportunity offers, unless they were thus ordered of old; in which case the bishop must take care that a proper division be made of the income, &c.; orders also that one be constantly resident upon the church, and faithfully and honestly perform divine service, and administer the sacraments, &c.

13. Forbids to hold several dignities, parsonages, and benefices, without a special dispensation from the apostolic see; confirms the thirteenth of Lateran, A.D. 1179.

14. Orders that bishops compel their clergy to conform to the sixteenth of Lateran, A.D. 1216, in their apparel and the trappings of their horses, so as to wear garments of decent length, and those in holy orders, close capes, especially in the church, and before their prelates, and in assemblies of the clergy; those that have rectories to wear such every where in their parishes; bishops to take care that all these things be

London, 1237. observed, in the first place, by the clergy about their own persons.

15. Orders that married clergymen retaining their wives or other women be wholly deprived, and forbids to apply any of their goods acquired after their marriage to the use of their children or wives; but orders such to be made over to the churches which they had, or in which they were beneficed; forbids to admit their sons to any benefice.

16. Orders all clerks keeping concubines entirely to forsake them within a month, upon pain of suspension until they have afforded satisfaction; otherwise they are declared *ipso jure* deprived.

17. Forbids the sons of clerks to succeed to their fathers' benefices upon their death, without an intermediate successor; orders that all who have already gotten such benefice be deprived by this statute.

18. Orders the excommunication of all persons sheltering robbers, and keeping them in their houses after three monitions.

19. Approves of the determination arrived at by the abbots of the order of S. Benedict in chapter, that according to their rule, all, except the infirm, should abstain from flesh; orders that novices, at the end of their year of probation, shall be compelled, by canonical censures, to make profession; extends this to nuns and canons.

20. Directs archdeacons to visit faithfully, to make enquiry as to the sacred furniture and vestments, the performance of the diurnal and nocturnal services, &c.; forbids them to burden the churches with superfluous expenses; orders them to demand moderate procurations, to take no stranger with them, and to be modest in their retinue, &c.; forbids them to receive money for not visiting or punishing; orders them to be present frequently in the chapters of every deanery, and there diligently to instruct the priests, amongst other things, to live well and to understand the canons of the mass and of baptism.

21. Strictly forbids all prelates, archdeacons, deans, and officials to hinder parties willing to compound their disputes and to be reconciled, from withdrawing from their judicature.

22. Exhorts bishops to do their duty and be a pattern to their flocks, to reside upon their cathedral

churches, to celebrate mass decently there, on the principal festivals, and on the Lord's day, in Lent and Advent; to visit their dioceses, and to consecrate churches; enjoins them to cause the profession which they made at their consecration, to be read to them twice a-year, viz. at Advent and the greater Lent [1].

23. Orders that matrimonial causes be judged by prudent and skilful men, well exercised in such questions; forbids those to whom privilege or custom permits the cognizance of such causes to pass any definitive sentence without having first consulted with the bishop of the diocese.

24. Orders that the oath of calumny [2], in all ecclesiastical causes, and of speaking the truth in spiritual causes, be for the future taken in the kingdom of England, notwithstanding any custom to the contrary whatever.

25. Relates to proctors.

26. Relates to letters of summons; orders that they shall not be served by the party obtaining them, but by an officer of the judge.

27. Forbids all falsification in drawing up sealed instruments; declares such to be forgery, and subjects the offender to the penalties for forgery.

28. Orders archbishops, bishops, and their officials, abbots, priors, deans, archdeacons, and their officials, also rural deans, cathedral chapters, colleges, and convents, to have a seal, with the name of their dignity, office, or college, and their own proper names, engraven on it in plain letters; enjoins them to be very careful in keeping their seals, and very cautious in setting them to any writing.

29. Relates to ecclesiastical judges and their duties [3].

On the third day, the lord legate solemnly began "Te Deum," all standing up, and after the Antiphon, "In viam pacis," the Benedictus, and the Blessing, as Matt. Paris says, with little joy, all departed.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A.D. 1237. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 528. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 647.

London, 1238.

LONDON. Held May 17, 1238. The legate

[1] The canon law mentions three Lents.

[2] This oath was taken by the plaintiff and defendant, and was to the effect, that the party believed his cause to be just, that he would use no false evidence, nor cause needless delay, nor give any bribe.—*Johnson.*

[3] Sir H. Spelman's copy divides this last constitution into three.

Otto, in this council, demanded satisfaction for an insult committed against him by the university of Oxford, on account of which he had laid the city of Oxford under an interdict, and suspended the university from the exercise of all its functions. Satisfaction having been made by the archbishop of York and the other bishops present, Otto removed the interdict and the inhibition. —*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 663.

London, 1268. LONDON. Held April 23rd, 1268, by Othobon[4], cardinal deacon of S. Adrian, legate of the apostolical see, in the cathedral church of S. Paul, London; Boniface of Canterbury, and Walter of York, with all the bishops of the English, Welsh, Scotch, and Irish branches of the Church being present. Thirty-six Legatine constitutions were published.

1. Urges upon the clergy the importance of frequently preaching upon the duty of bringing infants to holy baptism at the canonical times: viz. on the Sabbaths before the Resurrection and Pentecost, and of disabusing the people of the popular error, that danger would befal their children if baptized on those days; orders parish priests to teach their people the form of baptism.

2. Forbids simony and the extortion of money for administering the sacraments; orders confessors to absolve their penitents in these words, "By the authority of which I am possessed, I absolve thee from thy sins;" forbids gaolers to deny their prisoners the grace of confession before execution.

3. Relates to the consecration of churches, &c. (See Constitution 1, London, 1237.)

4. Declares that the holy synod, abominating the enormities of those clergymen who, forgetting God and their own credit, dare to bear arms and to associate themselves with highwaymen and robbers, and share in their plunder, ordains that all clerks bearing arms be *ipso facto* excommunicated; and in case they do not make satisfaction at the bishop's discretion, if beneficed, they be deprived of all preferment; if not beneficed, that they be incapable of holding any preferment for five years.

5. Relates to the dress, &c., of clerks, and confirms

[4] This Othobon had formerly been archdeacon of Canterbury, and subsequently was chosen to the popedom, and took the name of Adrian V.

the 14th of London, 1237, under Otto. Declares it to be scandalous that a clerk should not be distinguishable from a layman, and continues, "we ordain and strictly charge that no clergyman wear garments ridiculous or remarkable for their shortness, but reaching to below the middle of the leg; their ears visible, and not covered with hair; and that they wear decent crowns, of an approved breadth. . . . . Let them never wear coifs in their churches, and before prelates, or publicly, except in travel. Let all priests, deans, and others having cure of souls, wear close capes, except when journeying, &c." Offences against this constitution to be visited with suspension. Orders archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons to make diligent inquiry. Orders regulars, when advanced to the episcopate, to continue to wear their monastic dress. London, 1268.

6. Forbids all rectors of churches, perpetual vicars, and priests, to accept of a secular jurisdiction from a secular person. Orders all such as have accepted this to relinquish it within two months; all offenders to be *ipso facto* suspended from office and benefice.

7. Forbids clergymen to exercise the office of advocates in a secular court in a cause of blood, or any other cause except those allowed by law. Offenders to be suspended.

8. Relates to the continence of the clergy. (See 16th constitution of London, 1237.)

9. Renews the 10th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

10. Renews and extends the 11th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

11. Renews and extends the 12th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

12. Relates to the inviolability of sanctuary, and enacts that if any one do by violence, directly or indirectly, drag away any one that flees to a church, churchyard, or cloister, or prohibit him needful food, or carry or cause to be carried away what others have placed for him, he shall be *ipso facto* excommunicated; and unless satisfaction be made within the time appointed by the diocesan, his land shall be laid under ecclesiastical interdict. Declares the same penalty against burners and breakers of churches, plunderers of the property of ecclesiastics, &c. Orders the publication of this constitution in all churches.

London, 1268.

13. Forbids to hinder the solemnization of matrimony lawfully contracted in the face of the Church.

14. Relates to the care of last wills and testaments.

15. Orders the revenues of vacant benefices to be disposed of, not to the profit of the prelates to whom they are subject, but according to canon; unless the prelate can in any case plead a right and privilege. Forbids all uncanonical sequestrations, and orders that the prelate making such sequestrations shall be suspended from the use of the Dalmatic tunic and sandals till he shall revoke them.

16. Declares that all permissions to erect private chapels in another man's parish, shall be accompanied by the clause, "so that it be done without prejudice to the right of another;" and therefore enacts, that the chaplains ministering in such chapels as have been granted, saving the rights of the mother church, shall restore to the rector of that church all oblations, &c., which, but for the erection of the said chapel, would have come to the mother church. Offenders to be suspended until restitution.

17. Orders that all clergymen shall take care to repair decently the houses and other edifices belonging to their benefices. If the incumbent, after a monition from his bishop or archdeacon, neglect for the space of two months to repair, the bishop shall cause what is required to be done out of the revenue of the benefice. Also orders that the chancels of churches shall be repaired by those whose duty it is to do so. Charges all archbishops, bishops, and other inferior prelates, to keep their own houses, &c., in repair.

18. Forbids to demand procuration without visiting; also forbids bishops and others to make visitations with too large a retinue, so as to burden their clergy, See 20th constitution of London, 1237 [5].

19. Renews the 20th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

20. Renews the 7th constitution of London, 1237, against farming Church revenues, &c.

[5] This constitution bids visitors follow the "moderation" enjoined by the Lateran council, under Alexander III., which allows an archbishop to visit with forty or fifty horses or men, a bishop with twenty or thirty, the archdeacon with five or seven, and a rural dean with two.

21. Renews the 22nd constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

22. Strictly forbids bishops to confer churches subject to them on another bishop, monastery, or priory, by right of appropriation, except for very sufficient cause. "Some also," it is added, "that they may swallow the whole of the profits of a church that used to be under a rector, but is now granted to them, leave it destitute of a vicar; or if they do institute a vicar, leave him but a small portion, insufficient for himself, and for the charges of the living." Orders that if such impropriators refuse to assign to their vicar a sufficient portion, according to the value of their churches, the diocesan shall thenceforth take care to do it. Orders those that have churches to their own use, to build houses for the reception of the visitors.

23. Relates to the distribution of the effects of persons dying intestate.

24. Enacts that archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries shall commit causes to none but persons of dignity or office.

25. Renews and extends the 26th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

26. Renews and extends the 29th constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

27. Renews and extends the 21st constitution of London, 1237 (which see).

28. Orders that when any one is released from sentence of excommunication, suspension, or interdict, some person be commanded to notify the same at proper times and places.

29. Renews and extends the 12th and 13th constitutions of London, A. D. 1237, concerning pluralities and residence.

30. Is directed against the practice of holding vacant churches *in commendam*, which it most vehemently reprobates; it revokes all existing grants of churches *in commendam*, unless made for the advantage of the Church; then regulates with what restrictions commendams be granted in future.

31. Enjoins that when the confirmation of an episcopal election is demanded, inquiry shall be made, amongst other things, whether the elect held, before his election, more than one benefice with cure of souls; and whether in that case he was lawfully dispensed

with. If the inquiry be unsatisfactory, confirmation of the election to be denied.

32. Is directed against the mock resignations, practised by those who, wishing to obtain a vacant church, and fearing to be defeated on account of already holding more than one benefice, resigned them into the hands of the collators, upon condition that they should be restored to them, if unsuccessful. This constitution forbids to restore them.

33. Forbids any money to be given on account of a presentation.

34. Forbids to hold markets or carry on any business in any churches.

35. Orders that a solemn public procession be made every year on the morrow after the octave of Pentecost, (Trinity Monday,) in which all the faithful, both religious and secular, may return thanks to God, and pray for peace, and the restoration of the Holy Land to the worshippers of Christ.

36. Orders all archbishops and bishops to be diligent in defending churches and ecclesiastical persons; charges them to observe the constitutions of the fathers and the Roman pontiffs; and orders that a copy of these constitutions be kept by all archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, exempt and cathedral chapters, and that publication of them be made annually in all provincial and diocesan synods.

Besides these, there are fifteen (or seventeen) other constitutions assigned by some to this council, relating solely to the regulars, but they appear not to have been read in open council; the legatine constitutions evidently end with the injunction for their publication.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1268. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 525. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 1.

London, 1286. LONDON. Held April 30, 1286. John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by three bishops and several doctors, condemned various erroneous propositions concerning the body of our Lord after his death.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 123.

London, 1297. LONDON. Held January 14, 1297, by Robert of Canterbury and his suffragans; who, during eight days, deliberated upon the demand made by king Edward, of a subsidy from the clergy, without, however, being able to arrive at any settlement. On the 26th March, the archbishop convoked another council at S. Paul's,

Another in the same year.

in which two advocates and two preaching friars endeavoured to prove that it was lawful for the clergy to aid the king with their property in time of war, notwithstanding the pope's prohibition.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 225.

LONDON. Held on the Friday after the feast of the conversion of S. Paul, in the church of S. Paul, in London, by Simon Mepham, archbishop of Canterbury. Nine constitutions were published. London, 1328.

1. Enacts and ordains that the holy day of preparation, in which our Saviour, after being scourged, laid down his precious life upon the cross for the salvation of men, be celebrated as a festival [6], according to the rites of the Church, in reading with silence, in prayer with fasting, in compunction with tears, and forbids that any attend to their servile work on that day. Exempts the poor from the operation of this law, and allows the rich to afford their customary assistance to the poor in tilling their lands, for charity's sake.

2. Orders the solemn observation of the feast of the conception of the blessed Virgin.

3. Is directed against the violators of ecclesiastical liberty and persons.

4. Sentences to excommunication all who obstruct the testaments or last wills of villains appertinent to lands, and others of a servile condition.

5. Forbids ordinaries to take any thing by way of fee for the insinuation [7] of the will of a poor man, whose goods do not exceed one hundred shillings sterling [8] (about £23).

6. Repeals a constitution made in a council at Oxford, in which it is forbidden frivolously to appeal from any judicial grievance before definitive sentence.

7. Excommunicates all who directly or indirectly hinder the collection of offerings, tithes, and other church dues; reserves their absolution to the diocesan.

8. Relates to the publication of banns, and confirms the fifty-first chapter of Lateran, A. D. 1216, (by which it is forbidden to marry without publication of banns first made on several solemn days.) Inflicts suspension for

6 "Festivè, id est, ad instar diei Festi."

7 That is, the opening and publishing of it before the ordinary. —*Johnson.*

8 According to Lyndwood, the old English penny had the impression of a starling upon it, whence the origin of the phrase.

three years on all priests present at marriages otherwise contracted. Suspends for one year every priest, regular or secular, present at a marriage solemnized any where but in the parish church, unless there be special licence.

9. Inquisitions concerning defects of houses and other things belonging to ecclesiastical benefices, to be made by credible persons, sworn in form of law. The diocesan to see to the expenditure of the sum taxed for the repairs, &c.

In this council also there was a complaint made of the poverty of the university of Oxford, occasioned by litigation in defence of its rights, and a pastoral letter is extant of John Drokenesford, bishop of Bath and Wells, enjoining a collection for the relief of its necessities, to be made in that as in other dioceses.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1328. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 551 and 552.

London, 1342. LONDON. Held October, 1342, by John Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury. Thirteen constitutions (by some called the Extravagants) were published.

1. Suspends from the celebration of Divine service, for the space of one month, any priest celebrating mass in any oratory, chapel, house, or place being unconsecrated, without licence of the diocesan. Restricts the granting of such licences by bishops, to the case of great and noble men dwelling far from the parish church (i. e. more than one mile), or notoriously sick and infirm.

2. Forbids the clerks of archdeacons and officials to receive more than twelve-pence for writing letters of inquest, institution, collation, &c.; and more than six-pence for letters upon taking any sacred order. Forbids various other fees, such as for sealing letters to door-keepers, *barbers*[9], &c.

3. Orders that archdeacons, their officials, and all such as are bound to induct clerks, be content with moderate charge; i. e. forty-pence for the archdeacon, if he induct in person, or two shillings for his official. Suspends offenders from office, and forbids their entrance into the Church until they have made restitution.

[9] "*Barbers:*" these barbers were to see that the cut of the clerk's hair was precisely canonical before he went into the bishop's presence.

4. Complains that the monks of the province having appropriated churches, and eagerly endeavouring to apply their revenues to their own purposes, did not give any thing in charity to the poor; and that such conduct tended to make the payers of tithe and ecclesiastical dues not only indevout but invaders and destroyers, and consequently enacts, that all religious persons having ecclesiastical benefices shall be compelled by the bishops to distribute every year to the poor parishioners a certain portion of their benefices in alms, at the discretion of the bishops, and under pain of sequestration for disobedience. London, 1342.

4. Declares, that though parishioners, by laudable custom, are bound to make and repair at their own cost the bodies, roofs, and steeples of their churches, with the altars, images, and glass windows in them, &c. yet the religious, and others having estates, farms, and rents within the bounds of the several parishes, unjustly refuse to contribute towards such expences (although such burdens for the most part were taxed in proportion to the farms and estates); enacts that all the religious, having any such estates, rents, &c. in any parish, shall be compelled by the ordinaries, by ecclesiastical censures, to bear their due share of all such burdens.

5. Relates to the fees taken for the *insinuation*[1] of the will of a deceased person, and letter of acquittance. (See fifth London, A. D. 1328.)

6. Relates to the irregularities and extortion practised by some archdeacons and other ordinaries upon visitation, declares that they did often exact procurations without ever seeing the inside of the church; that they by contrivance arranged so as to lodge at the houses of the rectors or vicars on the night before the visitation-day, bringing with them cumbersome retinues and dogs for hunting, to the great cost of the incumbents, without, however, in the least abating their demand for procurations in consideration of such expences; prohibits, under pain of suspension, these and similar abuses on the part of visitors.

7. Enacts that every consistory, session, and chapter, held by the officials of bishops, archdeacons, and other ordinaries, shall be held in the most eminent places of the several jurisdictions and deaneries, where victuals

[1] See note to Constitution fifth of London, A.D. 1328.

may be easily procured, and all expences paid by their principals; so that the rectors and vicars of rural parishes may not be burdened with the maintenance of such officials in remote places where provisions were dear. Annuls the former law which ordered primary citations to be served upon their parishioners by rectors, vicars, or parish priests; orders that they shall be executed by the officials, deans, apparitors, or other ministers of the ordinary.

8. Relates to the extortions practised by the apparitors of ordinaries; permits only one riding apparitor for every diocese, and one foot apparitor for every deanery, who shall stay with the rectors and vicars only one day and one night in every quarter. Offenders to be suspended, the deputers from office and benefice, and the persons deputed from their office of apparitor.

9. Forbids to commute corporal penance for money, where the offender has relapsed more than twice.

10. Relates to the purgation of persons defamed for crimes; forbids to appoint a remote spot, and a large number of compurgators.

11. Forbids archdeacons and their officials to receive more than one penny for inserting in the matricula [2] the names of assisting priests [i. e. priests who had neither institution nor licence to serve the cure from the bishop].

12. Is directed against intruders into benefices during the life-time of the incumbents, and those who intrude them; renews the tenth constitution of London, 1268.

13 [3]. Forbids to hinder the exercise of their right of patronage by those who have recovered it in the king's court, provided the benefice be vacant.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1342. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 696. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1876.

London, 1343. LONDON. Held March 20, 1343, in the cathedral of S. Paul, by John de Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, with eleven of his suffragans, viz. Radulph of London, Roger of Lichfield and Coventry, John of Exeter, Robert of Salisbury, Robert of Chichester, Thomas of Hereford, Radulph of Bath, Simon of Ely, Thomas of Lincoln, Wolstan of Worcester, David of

[2] The archdeacon's list, in which the names of these mass-priests, or assisting-priests, were kept.

[3] There were only twelve constitutions, according to the record preserved in Wilkins, and they are somewhat differently arranged.

Bangor. The other bishops appeared by their proxies. Sixteen constitutions were published. London, 1343.

1. Excommunicates all malefactors and disturbers of the peace of the Church and the king, and other such unruly persons; reserves the absolution of such to the ordinaries.

2. Declares that beneficed men, and even those in holy orders, despised the tonsure, and let their hair fall down their backs; that they apparelled themselves rather like soldiers than clerks, with an upper jump, short and wide, with long hanging sleeves, not covering the elbows; that they had their hair curled and powdered, and wore caps, with tippets of a wonderful length, and long beards, and rings on their fingers; that they were girt with girdles exceedingly large and costly, and having purses enamelled with figures, and knives hanging like swords; that their shoes were chequered with red and green, and immensely long and variously pinked; moreover, that they had cruppers to their saddles, and baubles like horns on their horses' necks, and wore fur edging to their cloaks; declares that all offenders in this way be suspended at the end of six months from the time of admonition, except they reform in the interim; provides also against similar excesses in unbeneficed men.

3. Renews and extends the seventh constitution of London, A.D. 1237, and the twentieth of London, A.D. 1268, against letting out churches to laymen to farm.

4. Is directed against the various tricks and acts of roguery, by which tithe-payers tried to elude the payment of their tithe: sentences offenders to excommunication.

5. Declares that a real predial tithe of all ceduous woodlands is to be paid to the mother churches, and defines a ceduous woodland to be that which is kept on purpose to be felled, and which being cut down from the roots grows up again: those who refuse to be compelled by Church censures.

6. Sentences to excommunication all laymen whatsoever who seize or dispose of any oblations made in any church or chapel, &c., under any pretext whatever.

7. Renews and explains the fifteenth constitution of Lambeth, A.D. 1261, against those lords of the fees, who refuse to permit the debts of persons dying intestate to be paid out of their moveables, and their

London, 1343. goods to be distributed for the use of their wives, children, &c.; also against those who obstruct the free making and execution of wills and testaments, by such as are tenants in villainage, unbetrothed women and others: declares all offenders to be excommunicated.

This constitution regulates many other points relating to wills and testaments, executors, &c.

8. Relates to the wills and testaments of beneficed clerks, and to the disposal of their property when they die intestate.

9. Forbids persons in danger of death to give away and alienate all their goods, to the injury of the Church, the king, their creditors, and wives and families; offenders against this statute, both those who give and those who receive, to be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and the former to be further denied Christian burial.

10. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to observe night-watches in behalf of the dead, before their burial, on account of the abuses to which these nocturnal meetings gave rise.

11. Declares all persons contracting illegal marriages, and priests wilfully solemnizing such marriages, or any marriage between persons not belonging to their own parishes, and all others aiding such marriages, and all those present at them, to be *ipso facto* excommunicated; explains the eighth constitution of London, A.D. 1328, and states that it includes parochial chapels as well as churches.

12. Pronounces such great men and secular potentates to be involved in a sentence of greater excommunication, as hinder prelates from making enquiry into offences, &c.; also all persons who, by tumult, &c., terrify the judges and parties litigant in the ecclesiastical courts, and generally all those who obstruct the ecclesiastical courts and bishops exercising their proper jurisdiction: orders such offenders to be publicly denounced as excommunicated four times a-year, in every parish church in the province.

13. Relates to the case of excommunicated persons, who, having been taken up upon the prelate's certificate, and lodged in gaol, are unlawfully released, without making satisfaction for their offences, by the king's writ, upon their giving security to stand to the commands of the Church and to obey the law, which, however, they did not mean to do: orders persons so

making their escape from prison, to be publicly denounced as excommunicated in the most solemn manner, with bells tolling and candles lighted, to their greater confusion and shame. Forbids all persons, under pain of being smartly punished, to have any communication with them.

14. Forbids lay persons, under pain of excommunication, to cut down or apply to their own use, or that of the Church itself, or that of others, the trees, or grass, growing in churchyards, without the rectors' consent.

15. Excommunicates those who violate[4] sequestrations lawfully laid by bishops, or their vicars general, and officials.

16. Declares to be *ipso facto* excommunicate all clerks, or lay persons, who directly, or indirectly, fraudulently and maliciously obtain the king's warrant upon false accusations against innocent persons, whom they wish to injure, and so cause them to be banished, outlawed, &c.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1343. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1876.

LONDON. Held in 1382, by William Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by seven bishops and several doctors and bachelors in theology, and in canon and civil law. Ten propositions of Wiclif were declared heretical; viz. First, that in the sacrament of the altar, the substances of the bread and wine remain after consecration. Second, that the accidents cannot remain after the consecration without the substance. Third, that Jesus Christ is not actually and really in his proper corporeal presence in the eucharist. Fourth, that no priest or bishop in mortal sin may ordain, or consecrate, or baptize. Fifth, that outward confession is not necessary to those who duly repent. Sixth, that no passage can be adduced from the Gospels showing that our Lord instituted the mass. Seventh, that God must obey the devil. Eighth, that if the pope be an impostor, or a wicked man, and consequently a member of the devil, he hath no power over the faithful, except such as he may have received from the emperor. Ninth, that after the death of the present pope, Urban VI., no pope ought to be recognized, but people should

London, 1382.

[4] That is, apply to their own use such chattels as are, by the judge of the court, put into the keeping of a third party, pending the suit.

live, like the Greeks, according to their own laws[5]. Tenth, that it is contrary to Holy Scripture for ecclesiastical persons to hold temporal possessions.

The council declared fourteen other propositions erroneous, and the archbishop obtained of the king authority to arrest and imprison all persons teaching and maintaining their opinions. The king's letter is dated July 12.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2052. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 157.

London, 1396. LONDON. Held in 1396, at St. Paul's cathedral, by Thomas Arundel, archbishop, who in it condemned eighteen articles from the trialogus of Wiclif.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 229.

London, 1413. LONDON. Held in September, 1413, by the archbishop of Canterbury, against Sir John Oldcastle, who denied any change in the substance of the bread in the sacrament of the altar, the necessity of confession to a priest, and the duty of reverencing images; and who, moreover, maintained that the pope himself, with the archbishop and prelates, were the head and tail of Antichrist. He was condemned and declared to be a convicted heretic, and, as such, delivered to the secular arm, whilst all his abettors were excommunicated.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 353. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2323.

London, 1415. LONDON. Held in 1415, by Henry Chichley, archbishop of Canterbury. Four bishops[6] were, according to ancient custom, chosen to represent the Anglican Church in the council of Constance.—*Collier, Ch. Hist.* vol. i. p. 641.

London, 1416. LONDON. Held in 1416, by Henry Chichley, archbishop, in the cathedral church of S. Paul. In this synod (or convocation) it was enacted that all bishops of the province and their archdeacons, should, by themselves or by their officials, diligently twice a year at least, make inquiry in every rural deanery after persons suspected of heresy, and cause three or more men of good report, in every deanery or parish, where heretics were supposed to dwell, to swear to give information of

[5] Collier's translation (Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 573) is, "all Christendom ought to live independently, like the Greek Church." At all events, this passage proves how little claim the Church of Rome had to the title of the "Catholic Church," even in those times.

[6] The bishops of Salisbury, Bath, and Hereford, the abbot of Westminster, and the prior of Worcester, were chosen, as Collier states.

any heretics keeping private conventicles, or differing in their life and manners from the generality of the faithful, or having suspected books written in the vulgar tongue; orders archdeacons, commissaries, and diocesans, respectively to take steps against persons so accused; and directs that persons found guilty, but not handed over to the secular court [to be burnt] should be committed to perpetual or temporary imprisonment.

This constitution was published by the archbishop, July 1st, 1416.

Another constitution was made in this convocation, regulating the probate of wills and administration.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, 1416. Tom. xii. Conc. p. 299. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 377.

London, 1430. LONDON. Held February 20th, 1430, at S. Paul's, by H. Chichley, archbishop. In this synod (or convocation) a constitution was made, excommunicating all persons using or keeping illegal weights, especially that called "*Auncel*," "*Scheft*," or "*Pounder;*" and declares that many persons were in the habit of buying of simple folks their goods by the greater or "*Auncel*" weights, and selling their own commodities by lesser measure or weight, called "*Avoir de poys*," or "*Lyggyng Wyghtys.*"—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, 1430. Tom. xii. Conc. p. 439. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 517.

London, 1434. LONDON. Held October 7th, 1434, at S. Paul's, by H. Chichley, archbishop, in which a form of publishing the articles of the sentence of excommunication in the vulgar tongue was read, and appointed to be declared at high mass, yearly, in every church, on the first Sunday in Lent, on the Sunday after Trinity, and on the first Sunday in Advent.—*See Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, 1434. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 523.

London, 1463. LONDON. Held July 6th, 1463, in S. Paul's, by Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, the prelates and clergy of the province being there convocated. Two constitutions were published.

1. Prohibits, under pain of excommunication, any secular officer to arrest or force out of any sacred place, particularly the church of S. Paul in London, (especially while divine service is there celebrated,) any person whatever.

2. Declares that although the preachers of God's word had sufficiently declaimed against the newly-contrived fashions in apparel, yet few, either of clergy

or people, had desisted; therefore enacts, that no priest or clerk in holy orders, or beneficed person, do wear publicly any gown or upper garment but what is close before, and without bordering of furs; and that no one but a graduate of some university do wear a cap with a cape [caputium penulatum], nor a double cap, nor a single one with a cornet, nor a short hood, after the manner of prelates and graduates, nor any thing gilt on their girdle, sword dagger, or purse; and that none of the aforesaid, nor any one in the service of a prelate, abbot, dean, &c., do wear ill-contrived garments scandalous to the Church, nor "*bolsters*[7]" about their shoulders in their doublet, coat, or gown, nor an upper garment so short as not to cover their middle parts, nor shoes monstrously turned up at the toes; orders all offenders to be deprived of the profits of their benefices, if they have any, and if they have none, to be deprived of the exercise of their offices (whether they be clerks or laics), until they reform.—*Johnson's Ecc. Canons*, A.D. 1463. Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1419. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 585.

London, 1486. LONDON. Held February 13th, 1486, in S. Paul's, by John Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, and his suffragans. One constitution was published; which enacts that every bishop of the province shall cause a service and six masses to be said for the soul of a departed bishop, within a month from the time of their hearing of his death.

On one day during the synod, several doctors, both secular and religious, who were in the habit of preaching God's word at S. Paul's Cross, appeared before the archbishop and other prelates, and were admonished, for the future, not to preach against the Church or against ecclesiastics before the lay-people. If any spiritual person behaved himself ill and wickedly, the ordinary was to be informed of it; but if the ordinary did not correct such offender, the archbishop was to be appealed to, and finally, if he did not punish the delinquent, then it was the said prelate's will, that the preachers would declaim against him, and no other person.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 618. Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1466. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons.*

London, 1547. LONDON. Held in the church of S. Paul, by

[7] This word is expressed in English.

Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. The questions of repealing the "Six Articles," made in the previous reign, of restoring the communion in both kinds, and of the celibacy of the clergy, were discussed and settled. — *Cardwell, Synodalia*, vol. ii. p. 419. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 15.

LONDON. Held in 1552, by Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Forty-two articles were sanctioned, intended to remove the diversity of opinions in the Church in matters of faith. London, 1552.

1. Of faith in the blessed Trinity.
2. Of the incarnation of our Lord.
3. Of the descent of Christ into hell:

"As Christ died and was buried for us, so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell; for the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection, but his Ghost departing from Him, was with the Ghosts that were in prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of S. Peter doth testify."

4. Of the resurrection.
5. Of the sufficiency of the doctrine of Holy Scripture to salvation.
6. That the Old Testament is not to be rejected.
7. That the three creeds are to be received.
8. Of original sin.
9. Of free-will.
10. Of grace.
11. "Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the homily of justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian men."
12. Of works done before justification.
13. Of works of supererogation.
14. That there is no man without sin but Christ alone.
15. Of sin against the Holy Ghost.
16. "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is when a man, of malice and stubbornness of mind, doth rail upon the truth of God's word manifestly perceived, and being enemy thereto, persecuteth the same; and because such be guilty of God's curse, they entangle themselves with a most grievous and heinous crime, whereupon this kind of sin is called and affirmed of the Lord unpardonable."
17. Of predestination and election.
18. That eternal salvation is to be obtained only by the name of Christ.

London, 1552.

19. "All men are bound to keep the moral commandments of the law.

"The law which was given of God to Moses, although it bind not Christian men as concerning the ceremonies and rites of the same: neither is it required that the civil precepts and order of it should of necessity be received in any common weal; yet no man (be he never so perfect a Christian) is exempt and loose from the obedience of those commandments which are called moral: wherefore they are not to be hearkened unto who affirm that Holy Scripture is given only to the weak, and do boast themselves continually of the Spirit, of whom (they say) they have learned such things as they teach, although the same be most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."

20. Of the Church.

21. Of the authority of the Church.

22. Of the authority of general councils.

23. Of "the doctrine of school authors" concerning purgatory, pardons, &c.

24. That none may minister in the congregation except he be called.

25. "It is most seemly and most agreeable to the Word of God, that in the congregation, nothing be openly read or spoken in a tongue unknown to the people, the which thing S. Paul did forbid, except some were present which should declare the same."

26. Of the sacraments:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit together a company of new people, with sacraments most few in number, most easy to be kept, most excellent in signification, as in baptism and the Lord's supper.

"The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should rightly use them; and in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect and operation, and yet not that of the work wrought [ex opere operato], as some men speak; which word, as it is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture, so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense. But they that receive the sacraments unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

"Sacraments ordained by the Word of God be not only, &c. . . . . our faith in Him," [the same with the first paragraph of art. 25, A.D. 1562].

27. That the wickedness of the minister does not take away the effectual operation of God's ordinances. London, 1552.

28. Of baptism.

29. Of the Lord's supper.

The same with art. 28, A.D. 1562, as far as the words, "hath given occasion to many superstitions;" it then proceeds thus:—

"Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be, at one time, in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places; and because (as the Holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's supper."

The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinances to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped.

30. Of the perfect oblation of Christ made upon the cross.

31. That the single state is commanded to no man by God's word. [The same with art. 32, A.D. 1562, as far as the words "to abstain from marriage."]

32. That excommunicated persons are to be avoided.

33. Of the traditions of the Church. [The same with art. 34, of 1562, as far as the words "woundeth the conscience of the weak brethren."]

34. "The homilies of late given and set out by the king's authority be godly and wholesome, containing doctrine to be received of all men, and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly."

35. That the book of prayers and ceremonies, and the book of ordering ministers, given to the Church of England by the king's authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to Holy Scripture.

36. Of civil magistrates:

"The king of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland. The bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

"The civil magistrate is ordained and allowed of

London, 1552. God; therefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience sake.

"The civil laws may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.

"It is lawful for Christians, at the commandment of the magistrate to wear weapons, and serve in lawful wars."

37. That the goods of Christians are not common.

38. That Christian men may take an oath.

39. "The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass.

"The resurrection of the dead is not as yet brought to pass as though it only belonged to the soul, which by the grace of Christ is raised from the death of sin, but is to be looked for at the last day; for then (as Scripture doth most manifestly testify) to all that be dead their own bodies' flesh and bone shall be restored, that the whole man may (according to his work) have either reward or punishment, as he hath lived virtuously or wickedly."

40. "The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly.

"They which say that the souls of such as depart hence do sleep, being without all sense, feeling, or perceiving, until the day of judgment; or affirm that the souls die with the bodies, and at the last day shall be raised up with the same; do utterly dissent from the right belief declared to us in Holy Scripture."

41. Against the heretics called Millenarii.

42. "All men shall not be saved at the length.

"They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavour at this time to restore the dangerous opinion, that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall at length be saved, when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by God's justice."—*Cardwell*, vol. i. pp. 1. 19. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 73.

London, 1553. LONDON. Held in October, 1553, at S. Paul's cathedral, the bishop of London presiding, in which the restoration of some of the doctrines abandoned in the previous reign was discussed, especially the doctrine of the real presence in the eucharist, and that of transubstantiation, both of which were assented to by the two houses of convocation, with the exception of some few members of the lower house. The "Catechism," published in the reign of Edward VI., was

condemned; and four questions were framed, to be disputed at Oxford, against archbishop Cranmer and bishops Ridley and Latimer.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 425. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 88.

LONDON. Held in 1554, in obedience to a royal mandate, addressed to the bishops of London, Chichester, Hereford, Bath and Wells, Gloucester, Lincoln, S. David's and Rochester; Edmund, bishop of London, presiding. It was first summoned to Oxford, and then altered to London. April 5th, eight clerks, by name Weston, Oglethorp, Chedseye, Seton, Cole, Jeffery, Fecknam, and Harpesfeld, were chosen to proceed to Oxford, in order to confer with Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, on certain points of faith; and on the 27th of the same month, the account of the examination of the deprived bishops, under the seal of the university, was presented. London, 1554.

On the 30th day of April, one Walter Phillips recanted before the bishops certain views which he had maintained, upon the subjects of the real presence and transubstantiation.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 427. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 94.

In another convocation, held towards the end of this year, an address was presented from the lower house of convocation to the bishops, in which they petitioned for various things, contained in twenty-eight articles. London, 1554.

Art. 2. Demands that all books, both Latin and English, containing heretical doctrines, should be burnt and destroyed: naming Cranmer's book against the Sacrament of the Altar, the book of Common Prayer, and the book of Ordering of Ecclesiastical Ministers, as well as suspected translations of Holy Scriptures.

4. Requires the enforcement of the laws made against heretics, Lollards, and false preachers.

5. Requires that the residence of beneficed clergymen be enforced.

7. Prays that her ancient liberties, &c., be restored to the Church, according to the article of the great charta, called "Magna Charta."

10. Requires the repeal of all statutes made during "the time of the late schism" against the liberties of the Church.

13. That those who do violence to clerks may be punished by the canon law.

London, 1554.

14. That beneficed clergymen may be compelled to wear their proper priestly habit.

15. That married priests may be compelled to forsake the women whom they have taken as their wives.

21. That the reparation of chancels be strictly enforced.

24. That such priests as were lately married, and refuse to reconcile themselves to their order, and to be restored to administration, may have some especial animadversions, whereby, as apostates they may be discerned from others.

25. That religious women who have married may be divorced.

28. That all ecclesiastical persons concerned in the late spoliation of cathedrals, churches, &c., may be compelled to make full restoration.

They also petitioned that bishops and their officials might be permitted without loss or obstruction :—

1. To compel lay impropriators to sustain the burdens of their churches.

2. To increase the stipend of vicars.

3. To compel parishioners to furnish the ornaments and other things necessary for the service of their churches.

4. To compel parishioners to pay the annual stipend to the minister of the church [commonly called the clerk (clericum)], as had been customary before the schism.

5. To compel the restitution of lands and other property belonging to the Church unlawfully occupied or detained.

6. They also prayed that payment of tithe of ceduous wood should be compelled as formerly.

7. That it should be lawful to take, on oath, the answers of those who were brought into a court of law on account of their own personal tithes.

8. That the canons, and other unmarried ministers, in the newly-erected cathedrals, should be compelled to have a common table.

9. That free leave to marry should be granted to those women which had been of late regarded as the wives of clergymen.

10. That rectors, vicars, and proprietors of churches should be compelled to have a certain number of sermons preached in their churches annually.

11. That the sin of simony, then most prevalent in the Church, should be severely punished.

12. That the same amount in money which was formerly paid by the rector to monasteries should now, in like manner, be paid by the lay impropriator.

13. That priests should not go to taverns and wine-shops, unless for the sake of procuring necessary food.

14. That rectors and vicars should not be permitted to let out their benefices to farm without the bishop's consent.

15. That bishops should have power to unite small parishes.

16. That in future no fair should be allowed to be held on the greater festivals and on Sundays.

Moreover, in this convocation, viz. in the seventh session, held December 7th, the bishops agreed upon a protest addressed to the king and queen, upon the subject of the state of the Church, in which they entreated their majesties to use their influence with cardinal Pole, that in dealing with the plunderers of Church property, he would consult the general peace and quiet, and consider rather the salvation of souls than the restoration of the temporalities; at the same time they promised to abide by his decision. They also entreated that the full enjoyment of their proper jurisdiction and ecclesiastical liberty might be restored to them, without which it was impossible for them to discharge their pastoral office.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 429—442. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 94.

LONDON. Held in October and November, 1554, by cardinal Pole, to whom license under the great seal was granted for the purpose; the archbishopric of Canterbury being still vacant, Edmund, bishop of London, presided in the upper house. London, 1554 (or 1555, *Wilkins*.)

In the second session, October 25th, the lower house, having been instructed to do so, elected ten deputies to appear before the bishops, and to hear the causes of assembling the convocation, which the bishop of Ely declared to be:—

1. The granting of a subsidy to the king and queen, who were in want of money, and who had deserved well of the clergy, by remitting the first-fruits and perpetual tenths, and by freely restoring all livings and benefices which had formerly been the property of monasteries and colleges.

2. The consideration of a plan concocted by cardinal Pole for disposing of these things.

He further recommended them to select learned men from amongst their body, who might examine the canons of the Church, in order to select from them those which might prove useful; and that new ones might be enacted if it should be necessary.

In the third session, held October 30th, the lower house sent a message to the bishops, to inform them that they had agreed to the subsidy; and to submit to their notice three things, in which they desired their assistance, one of which was, that the law should be abrogated, which enacted that citizens of London refusing to pay tithe should be cited before the mayor of London, and requiring that such causes should be heard and decided before the ordinary.

An article was also made permitting non-residence, and enumerating the various causes which rendered such a relaxation of the strictness of the canonical sanction necessary.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 442—447. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 120.

London, 1557. LONDON. Held in January, 1557, by Reginald Pole, archbishop of Canterbury, and cardinal, to consult upon the best means to be adopted for recovering the city of Calais, and upon the defects of the cathedral churches, rectories, vicarages, and the state of the Church generally, within the province of Canterbury. The bishops of London, Rochester, S. David's, Peterborough, and Gloucester, were specially commissioned to consider the question of Church reform; and on the 28th of January, the first mentioned prelate delivered in writing a list of such things as appeared to himself and the other bishops to need reform in their respective dioceses.

In the subsequent session, a subsidy to the queen was unanimously granted, and the following articles agreed upon for the purpose of removing the difficulty experienced in supplying poor benefices:

1. That no priests be taken up to serve the wars.

2. That two small benefices might be held in commendam, and served "alternis vicibus."

3. That parishioners of chapels annexed might be compelled to attend the parish church during the vacancy of the chapels.

4. That the bishops should receive the pope's per-

mission to confer orders at other than the canonical seasons. London, 1557.

The articles of reform, from which the following are taken, were probably those presented to convocation by the bishop of London and other bishops, as stated above, and by the lower house, which was also enjoined to consider the question, and to deliver the result of their deliberation in writing; whether they were confirmed by the synod is unknown.

Chapter 1 relates to doctrine, and requires that the people should, as far as possible, be instructed by preachers; and that four different kinds of short sermons, in English, should be drawn up for use in those places where preachers could not be had.

The first kind to relate to the holy Eucharist, penance, auricular confessions, &c.

The second kind to contain expositions upon the articles of faith, the Lord's prayer, and the like.

The third to contain brief discourses concerning time, and the saints.

The fourth upon the nature, use, &c., of the ceremonies prescribed by the Church; and also, concerning the different virtues and vices.

This chapter also recommends that a short catechism should be drawn up for young people, in Latin and English.

2. Relates to matters connected with prayer. Recommends that the book containing the Hours of the Blessed Virgin, the penitential Psalms, and other pious prayers, be published in Latin and English; also a form for grace, to be said at dinner and supper. Desires that the breviaries and missals should be corrected, and made uniform throughout the kingdom; that the same ceremonial should be observed in every diocese; and that all persons during Divine service should give themselves to prayer, or leave the Church.

3. Refers to the ornaments, vestments, and vessels of the Churches—orders silver chalices, decent thuribles, and a cross with a banner, that the altars be properly ornamented, that there be the books proper for God's worship, clean corporals and surplices, a crucifix, &c.

Also desires that the vestments, vessels, &c., which had been profaned, should be re-consecrated; that in every church the altar which had been destroyed,

London, 1557.

should be built up again, and all parts of the church and churchyard properly repaired.

4. Relates to the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and the reformation of the lives of the clergy.

Requires that in every synod the conduct of rectors, vicars, &c., during the past year should be inquired into; that no priest should keep a suspected woman in his house, nor exercise any trade.

That a bishop, priest, deacon, and sub-deacon found guilty of fornication, perjury, or theft, should be punished or deposed; if guilty of drunkenness or gambling, after admonition, should either desist, or be deposed.

That if a priest shall marry, he shall be deposed. That those who, after ordination, had married, but had separated from their wives, should not be permitted to officiate in the same diocese, and if they should be caught but speaking to their wives, they should be canonically punished.

It further requires that the sin of simony should be entirely put a stop to, and forbids patrons to sell livings; prohibits to excommunicate upon trifling grounds.

5. Treats of cathedral and other churches, and allows a plurality of benefices to learned men alone, as a reward for their learning.

6. Treats of the dress proper for the clergy, directs that all the clergy shall wear the proper clerical dress. It also enjoins the bishops to search after those who hid themselves in the woods and other concealed places, in order not to be compelled to attend their parish church on the appointed days.

7. Treats of universities and schools; enjoins that no one shall be admitted to orders who has not spent at least three years in the university, and proceeded to the degree of bachelor.

Then follow chapters referring—

1. To the duties of bishops.

2. To the qualifications to be required in candidates for orders.

3. To the fitness of persons to be admitted to benefices.

4. To the case of curates appointed to supply the places of beneficed men.

5. Relates to the not admitting to benefices by proxy.

6. Relates to the not permitting mere "*ex-officio*" citations before the ordinary. London, 1557.

7. Refers to persons non-resident on the plea of tudy.

8. To those who left their own benefices to serve others.

9. To preachers.

10. To heretics and heretical books [8].

11. To clerks convicted of crime.

12. To the dress of the clergy.

13. To those of the clergy who were addicted to field sports.

14. To those of the clergy and religious who had fallen into carnal sins.

15. To simony.

16. To those who were guilty of making agreements with the persons whom they presented to benefices.

17. To the honest conversation of clerks.

18. To schoolmasters.

19. To the inquiry to be made, especially in the universities, after heretics and heretical teaching.

20. Directs that the full number of religious shall be admitted into each monastery.

21. Refers to the education, &c., of the religious.

22. To the reception of apostates and other penitent religious.

23. Declares that letters falsely obtained shall not avail apostate religious.

24. Relates to impropriate churches and hospitals.

25. To the abuses committed in the churches and chapels of the Knights Hospitallers, such as marrying persons without banns, &c.

[8] This chapter declares that certain arch-heretics, within the province of Canterbury, had busily endeavoured to draw others after them into infidelity, by publishing and circulating tracts, both in Latin and English, which contained doctrines contrary to the Catholic faith and the teaching of holy mother Church. Amongst such it specifies the "Parable of the Mammon of Unrighteousness," "The Obedience of a Christian Man," "the translation of the New Testament made by William Hychens, alias Tyndal," "The Revelation of Antichrist," and some others. It then strictly forbids to sell, buy, give, print, &c., any book or tract, &c., containing in them sacred Scripture or an interpretation of it; and condemns the Latin writings of Luther, Lambertus, Pomerianus, Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Melancthon, Carolstadius, and many others.

26. To dilapidations.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 448—489. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 155.

London, 1558. LONDON. Held in January, 1558, during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury; the bishops of London, Worcester, Coventry and Lichfield, acting as commissioners. On the 27th January the mass of the Holy Spirit having been said in the choir of St. Paul's, they adjourned to the chapter-house, where the objects for which the synod had been convoked were declared.

On the last day of February the six articles following were read, which had been drawn up in the lower house, and which the bishops promised to present to the house of lords on the following day.

In the exordium, they declare that they profess from the heart the faith embodied in the following articles:

1. That in the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of the word of Christ being duly pronounced by the priest, the natural Body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, is really present under the species of bread and wine, and his natural Blood also.

2. That after consecration the substance of bread and wine do not remain, nor any other substance but that of God and man.

3. That in the mass the very Body and Blood of Christ is offered as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

4. That to the apostle St. Peter and to his legitimate successors in the apostolic see, as Christ's vicars, is given the supreme power of feeding and ruling the Church of Christ on earth.

5. That the authority to discuss and define in matters relating to the faith, the sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline, belongs solely to the pastors of the Church, and not to laymen.

6. Entreats the bishops to notify this declaration of their faith to the higher powers.

In a subsequent session the bishop of London informed the prolocutor and other clergy of the lower house, that he had presented the above articles to the lord chancellor, as speaker of the house of lords, who, it appeared, received them favourably, but made no answer.

In a session held March 10, the bishop of London informed the lower house, that all their articles, except the last, had received the approbation of the universi-

ties of Oxford and Cambridge.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 490—494. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 179.

LONDON. Held on the 12th January, 1562, Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, presiding. The first session was held in the chapter-house of St. Paul's cathedral, but nothing of interest passed. London, 1562.

The second session was held on the following day. The archbishop, in his cope, being met at the south door of the cathedral by the dean, canons, and others of the clergy in surplices, was conducted to the sacristy, whence he proceeded, accompanied by all the bishops of the province, habited in their proper vestments, to the choir, when the Litany was sung in English, and a Latin sermon preached by William Daye, provost of Eton. After which a psalm in English having been chanted, the holy communion was celebrated by Edmund Grindal, lord bishop of London; which being ended, the archbishop proceeded to the chapter-house and took his seat, surrounded by his suffragans, viz. Edmund, London; Robert, Winchester; William, Chichester; John, Hereford; Richard, Ely; Edwin, Worcester; Roland, Bangor; Nicholas, Lincoln; John, Salisbury: Richard, S. David's; Edmund, Rochester; Gilbert, Bath and Wells; Thomas, Coventry and Lichfield; William, Exeter; John, Norwich; Edmund, Peterborough; Thomas, S. Asaph; Richard, Gloucester. Session II. Jan. 13.

The archbishop then addressed the fathers and clergy present, pointing out to them how great an opportunity was now offered to them of reforming what needed correction in the Church of England, since the queen herself and the chief persons of the realm were inclined towards it.

In the following session the archbishop and seventeen bishops being present, the Litany and the other customary collects having been said in Latin by the archbishop himself, the election of Alexander Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, to be prolocutor of the lower house, was unanimously approved. After which the archbishop requested the fathers to consider with themselves what things in their respective dioceses appeared to them to need reform, to declare them in the next session. Session III. Jan. 16.

The next session was held in king Henry VII.'s chapel at Westminster. The same bishops were pre- Session IV. Jan. 19.

London, 1562. sent, and the same prayers said as in the previous session. A discussion upon certain articles of faith took place; and the prolocutor of the lower house informed the bishops that certain members of that house had brought forward papers concerning those matters which, in their judgment, needed reform; which, by common consent, were referred to a committee of learned members of their house for consideration. He also declared that the articles drawn up in the synod of London, tem. Edward VI., had been referred to a committee of the lower house for their consideration and correction, and that their opinion would be delivered in a future session. All of which was approved.

Session V. Jan. 20, at Westminster. In the fifth session, held at Westminster, the discussion concerning the faith, mentioned in the last session, was resumed.

In the sixth session, held at St. Paul's, and in the seventh and eighth, held at Westminster, the archbishop and bishops held secret discussions.

Session IX. Jan. 29. In the ninth session the archbishops and bishops being present as before, the Thirty-nine "Articles of Religion[9]" were unanimously subscribed by the bishops, and sent thence down to the lower house.

Session X. Feb. 3. In the tenth session, held at Westminster, the bishops held a secret conference.

Session XI. Feb. 5. The eleventh session was held in the chapter-house of S. Paul's; Edmund, bishop of London, Robert of Winchester, Edwin of Worcester, and Nicholas of Lincoln, were appointed a commission to act for the archbishop, who was absent, and to devise a plan of reform in discipline. The bishops of Salisbury, Lichfield and Coventry, S. David's, and Exeter, were unanimously appointed to form a committee to examine "The Catechism." After which the prolocutor of the lower house appeared, and exhibited the book of the Thirty-nine Articles, which had been sent down to the lower house for approval, and which had been examined and subscribed by many of its members; he requested that those who had not already signed, should be compelled to do so. Whereupon the fathers unanimously agreed that the names of those who had not subscribed should be brought before them in the following session.

[9] It is not necessary to insert the Articles, which are to be found in every Book of Common Prayer.

In the following session the same book of articles was produced by the prolocutor, and as some of the members of the lower house still refused to subscribe it, the bishops desired that their names should in the next session be specified. London, 1562. Session XII. Feb. 10.

In the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth sessions nothing requiring notice was transacted.

In the seventeenth session, held at S. Paul's, the archbishop and other bishops were present; certain articles of inquiry were delivered to the prolocutor of the lower house, to which they were required to send their answer in writing, amongst these articles were the following:— Session XVII. Feb. 19.

Whether some benefices rateable, be not less than they be already valued?

How many benefices they find that are charged with pensions of religious persons?

To certify how many benefices were vacant in every diocese.

In the following session, held at Westminster, the question of a subsidy to the queen was discussed, and it was unanimously agreed to grant it; which resolution was also agreed to by the lower house in the following session. Session XVIII. Feb. 22. Session XIX. Feb. 24.

In the next session, at S. Paul's, the prolocutor and ten members of the lower house, viz. George Carewe, dean of Windsor; Pedder, dean of Worcester; Salisbury, dean of Norwich; Latimer, dean of Peterborough; Cottrel, archdeacon of Dorset; Kennall, archdeacon of Exeter; Chaundler, archdeacon of Salisbury; Walker, archdeacon of Stafford; Hewett, precentor of S. David's; and Levar, archdeacon of Coventry; in the name of their house, presented to the bishops a book on the subject of discipline, which was referred to the bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, Hereford, and Ely, for examination. Session XX. Feb. 26.

In the twenty-first session, at Westminster, the prolocutor declared that the lower house desired to add certain other chapters to the book of discipline, which they had presented in the last session, and leave was granted to them. Session XXI. March 1.

In the next session, at Westminster, the lower house sent up to the bishops for their inspection and approval, the book entitled "Catechismus puerorum," written by dean Nowell, which they had unanimously approved. Session XXII. March 3.

London, 1562. Session XXIII. March 5.

In the twenty-third session, held at S. Paul's, the lower house sent up to the bishops for their consideration the book on discipline, mentioned before, with the additional chapters.

In the 24th, 25th, and 26th sessions, secret conferences were held by the bishops.

Session XXVII. March 15.

In the 27th session, William of Chichester was appointed commissioner for the archbishop to act in his absence.

During the eight following sessions nothing requiring notice was done, and on the 14th day of April, 1563, in the 36th session, held at Westminster, the royal brief proroguing the convocation was read.

In this council the Second Book of Homilies was sanctioned.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 495. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 232.

London, 1571.

LONDON. Held April 3, 1571, in S. Paul's cathedral, by Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, who presided. After the Litany had been chaunted, Dr. Whitgift preached a Latin sermon upon the institution and authority of ecclesiastical synods, the enemies of the Church; viz. the puritans and papists, the use of church vestments and ornaments, &c.

In the next session, held April 7, the prolocutor of the lower house having been elected, the archbishop directed that such members of that house as had not yet signed the thirty-nine articles of the synod of London, 1562, should at once do so, on pain of being entirely excluded from the house[1].

In the 3rd session, April 20, a subsidy to the queen was unanimously granted, and Richard, bishop of Gloucester, formally excommunicated for wilfully absenting himself, without just cause, from the 1st and 2nd sessions of the synod. The execution of this sentence was in the next session entrusted to the archdeacon of Gloucester, who, with the royal pursuivant, was directed to publish it in the cathedral of Gloucester.

[1] After the Articles of 1562 had been newly subscribed in this synod, they were committed to the editorship of bishop Jewel, who made certain alterations in them, which may be seen in Cardwell, vol. i. page 76, note. They appear then to have been again read and confirmed, in their new form, by both houses in this convocation. The puritanical accusation against Laud, of having forged an interpolation of the 20th Article, is met and disposed of by Collier, Church History, vol. ii. p. 486. See also Strype's Life of Parker, book iv. ch. v. p. 319.

In the 5th session, held May 4th (the day after the bill for confirming the articles by statute had been sent up by the House of Commons to the Lords), it was ordered "that when the Book of Articles touching doctrine shall be fully agreed upon, that then the same shall be put in print by the appointment of my lord of Sarum, and a price rated for the same to be sold. Item, that the same being printed, every bishop to have a convenient number thereof to be published in their synods throughout their several dioceses, and to be read in every parish church four times every year." London, 1571.

On the 12th of May, the sentence of excommunication against the bishop of Gloucester was temporarily removed, Anthony Higgins appearing as proctor for the absent bishop, and pleading his sickness.

On the 30th of May, the convocation was dissolved.

In this synod a Book of Canons of Discipline was published, which received the unanimous consent of the bishops, but not that of the lower house, nor did it ever receive the royal assent.

Chapter 1. Of bishops: directs that they shall diligently preach the gospel, not only in their own cathedral, but in such churches of their respective dioceses as may be most expedient; that they shall call all public preachers before them and take from them their licences to preach, and carefully select from amongst them those to whom fresh licences shall be given, who shall subscribe the thirty-nine articles.

That they shall be careful in the choice of the persons to be admitted into their service.

That their domestics shall dress modestly, &c.

That they shall not ordain any except he have been well instructed either at an university, or at school, or be sufficiently well-versed in Latin or divinity, and be of the proper age, of good report, and not brought up to agriculture or any common and sedentary craft. That the said person to be ordained shall be provided with a title; that bishops should suffer none who by an idle name called themselves readers, and had not received imposition of hands.

That every archbishop and bishop shall provide himself at home with a very large copy of the Holy Bible, the Book of Martyrs, and other like books, which shall be placed in the hall or eating room for the use of their domestics and of strangers.

London, 1571.

Chapter 2. Of the deans of cathedral churches: directs that they shall also provide themselves with the above-mentioned books, to be placed in their cathedrals for the use of the vicars, minor canons, and other ministers, as well as of strangers.

That deans and prebendaries shall diligently teach God's word.

That no dean, archdeacon, residentiary, &c., &c., shall in future wear the dress commonly called the Greek cloak (*Graium amicium*); that in their churches they shall wear the linen vestment, still retained by royal authority, together with the hood of their degrees.

That every dean shall reside at least four months in the year.

That they shall take care that no other form than that prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer be used in singing or saying prayers, and in the administration of the holy communion.

Chapter 3. Of archdeacons. Directs the same thing concerning the books as above.

That they shall visit their province in person annually.

That they shall call their clergy to account as to how far they have advanced in the study of Holy Scripture, and if any of them have not attained to the degree of M. A. in either University, they shall appoint them some portion of the New Testament to be gotten by heart and repeated at the next synod.

That they shall make a report of their visitation to the bishop.

That they shall annually carry to the bishop all the original copies of wills proved before them in the preceding year.

Chapter 4. Of chancellors, commissaries, officials. Directs that they shall not in any cause proceed so far as to pronounce sentence of excommunication, which shall be done by the bishop or some fit person in holy orders by him appointed [a form of excommunication is given].

That they shall do their utmost that all persons within their jurisdiction do their duty. And first, they shall see that rectors, vicars, &c., employ themselves in the study of divinity, and that they buy proper books. That those who are not masters of arts buy copies of the New Testament in Latin and English, and learn by heart such passages out of each as shall be selected by some one

of the bishop's appointing. That they observe the rules and rites commanded by the Book of Common Prayer, both in reading and praying, and also in the administration of the sacraments, without leaving out or adding any thing either in matter or form. That they live and dress decently and properly, do not frequent taverns, &c., nor play at dice, nor cards, nor any other improper games, but recreate themselves with archery in moderation and at proper times. London, 1571.

That no minister perform service any where without the bishop's authority, nor at more than one church in the same day.

That every minister before exercising his function do subscribe the thirty-nine articles.

Orders that rectors, &c., shall annually present to the bishop or his official the names of those who do not communicate, and forbids any one but a communicant to act as sponsor for a child.

That the sacred mystery shall be reverently, devoutly, clearly, and distinctly celebrated on all Sundays and holy days, so that the people may hear and understand and receive consolation and advantage, and that when there is no sermon a homily shall be read, and that care shall be taken that the young men who are most inclined to neglect religion shall not disturb the service by pulling the bells, walking about the church, talking, laughing, and tittering scurrilous jests.

That the people be warned to communicate frequently, and to prepare themselves beforehand, and in order that all may learn their duty, the minister shall on all Sundays and holy days come to church, and for two hours at least teach the catechism, and read to adults as well as boys and girls.

Chapter 5. Of Churchwardens, &c. Directs that they be elected annually according to the custom of each parish by the parishioners and minister; shall give in their accounts when they quit the office; present all offenders to the ordinary; keep their churches in repair and clean; provide a large Bible, Prayer-book and Book of Homilies, together with the Homilies lately written against Rebellion, a communion table made of pieces of wood joined, a clean carpet to cover it, and a pulpit and "sacred font." Orders that all roodlofts shall be removed; that no feastings, &c., be allowed in churches; that the bells be not superstitiously rung, either on the

London, 1571. eve of All Souls, or on the day after the Feast of All Saints. That pedlars, &c., be not allowed to vend their goods in church yards or porches, nor any where else on festivals and Sundays whilst service is being celebrated.

Directs further, that churchwardens shall observe whether parishioners attend church and communion, that they shall note down in a book the names of preachers and send it to the bishop.

Chapter 6. Of preachers. No one to preach without license to do so from the queen, archbishop, or bishop. Preachers to be careful that they teach nothing in their sermons, as a matter of faith, which is not agreeable to Holy Scripture and the old fathers and bishops. That whilst preaching they shall wear a sober and decent dress, such as is ordered in the "advertisements" of 1564[2]; to receive no money for preaching, but to be content with food and one night's lodging.

Chapter 7. Of Residence. Exhorts all pastors to reside sixty days in each year.

Chapter 8. Of pluralities. Forbids to hold more than two benefices at once, and allows that only when they amount to less than a certain sum.

9. Of schoolmasters:

Directs that no one shall act as schoolmaster or private tutor without the bishop's licence; that the bishop, before granting his licence, shall enquire concerning his orthodoxy, good conduct, &c. Schoolmasters to teach no grammar except that set forth by royal authority, and to use no catechism but that of 1570; to acquaint the bishop every year with the names of their most promising pupils.

10. Of patrons and proprietors:

Directs bishops seriously to exhort patrons of benefices to have the wants of the Church, and the fear of God, and of the last judgment, before their eyes, that if any sort of simoniacal bargain hath been made by them, directly or indirectly, with the person presented, their wicked conduct shall be published and notified both in the cathedral church and elsewhere; and the priest so presented shall be removed, not only from such benefice, but from every ecclesiastical ministration, and from the diocese.

[2] See "articles for outwarde apparell of persons ecclesiasticall," in the "Advertisement," Wilkins, Conc. vol. iv. p. 249, or Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker, p. 51.

That the queen be humbly petitioned to allow the dilapidated chancels of her churches to be repaired, and fit stipends allowed for ministers to serve in them.

That bishops take care that correct terriers of the lands, &c., belonging to rectories, &c., be made, and copies kept in their archives.

That the procurator of benefices shall have no power to admit or dismiss the minister; that the latter shall not take less than 10*l.* as his annual stipend.

That bishops shall have power to dissolve all marriages contracted within the limits forbidden in Levit. xviii., especially marriage contracted with the sister of a deceased wife.

That no marriage be contracted contrary to the tables set forth by the archbishop of Canterbury.

Signed by the two archbishops and twenty bishops, either with their own hands or by proxy.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 263.

London, 1572.

LONDON. Held May 9th, 1572, at S. Paul's, by Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, who opened the proceedings with a Latin speech, in which, after detailing the causes which led to the convocation of the synod, he exhorted the members of the lower house to avoid quarrelling and disputes, and to carry on their discussions with moderation and prudence, and further, to choose from their body some learned, grave, and fit men, who might consider what was requisite to be reformed in the Church.

No business of any importance was transacted notwithstanding.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 532. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 270.

London, or Westminster, 1575.

LONDON (or Westminster). Held February 10th at S. Paul's, Edmund, bishop of London, presiding, in virtue of a commission, the see of Canterbury being vacant; but in the second session, held February 17th, Edmund Grindal, the newly made archbishop of Canterbury, presided, and directed the prolocutor, and other members of the lower house, to take into their consideration the subject of ecclesiastical reform; and on the 17th of March, in a session held at Westminster, fifteen articles, touching "the admission of apt and fit persons to the ministry, and the establishing of good order in the Church," were unanimously agreed to and subscribed by the fathers.

1. That none be hereafter made deacon or minister

London, 1575. without testimonials of his honest life, and consent to the "Articles of Religion" (A.D. 1562); and he must be able to give account of his faith in Latin: Deacons to be, at least, twenty-three years of age, and to be one full year in deacon's orders before admission to the priesthood.

Holy orders to be conferred only on a Sunday or holy day, and after the form appointed by the book, entitled "The Form and Manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons."

2. Bishops not to ordain men from other dioceses without letter dimissory.

3. Unlearned ministers already made not to be hereafter admitted to any cure or benefice.

4. Diligent search to be made after such as have forged letters of orders, that they may be deposed.

5. Bishops to certify the names of such counterfeit ministers to one another.

6. None to be admitted to holy orders without a title.

7. None to be admitted to any cure of souls, except he be qualified according to article 1, nor to any dignity or benefice of the yearly value of 30*l.* or upwards, in the queen's books, unless he be a doctor in some faculty, or a B.D. at least, or an allowed preacher.

8. All licences to preach granted by archbishops or bishops within the province, before February 8, 1575, to be void.

9. Bishops to take care that preachers within their dioceses preach sound doctrine, and exhort to repentance, amendment of life, and liberal almsgiving; none to preach unless he be a deacon at least.

10. Bishops to see that the catechism be taught in every parish church, and the homilies read in order on every Sunday and holy-day when there is no sermon.

11. Directs that bishops shall see that parsons, &c., have copies of the New Testament in Latin and English or Welsh, and shall daily confer one chapter of the same, &c. [See the direction for the same thing, Chapters 3 and 4 of the book of Discipline, in the synod of London, A.D. 1571.]

12. Directs that since doubt hath arisen by what persons private baptism is to be ministered, "it is now by the said archbishop and bishops expounded and resolved, and every of them doth expound and resolve, that the said private baptism, in case of necessity, is

only to be ministered by a lawful minister or deacon, called to be present for that purpose, and by *none other*." This exposition to be published in every parish church in the province [3].

13. No commutation of penance into a pecuniary mulct to be ordinarily allowed.

14. Archdeacons and other ordinaries to call before them and examine all persons presented for offences, and to punish those who shall be found guilty.

15. Allows marriages to be celebrated at all times of the year, provided the banns have been first published in church, during service, on three several Sundays or holidays [4].—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 539, and vol. i. p. 182. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 284.

LONDON. Held 17th of January, 1580, at S. Paul's; the bishop of London presiding as *locum tenens* for Grindal, archbishop of Canterbury, who was sequestered and confined. London, 1580.

In the first session, a humble address to the queen, in favour of the archbishop, was drawn up by Toby Matthew, dean of Christ Church.

In the third session, the heresies broached by a new sect, called "The Family of Love," were brought before the synod, but nothing definite determined.

On the 2nd of March, the bishop of London dissolved the council.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. pp. 541. 543. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 292.

LONDON. Held November 24th, 1584, in the cathedral church of S. Paul, and afterwards adjourned to Westminster; Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, was not present; but a commission was issued to certain prelates and others to act in his place. London, 1584.

In the eighth session, a priest, named John Hilton, was charged with divers errors, heresies, and blasphemies; and another man, named Shoveller, with ministering, not being in holy orders. In the following session Hilton confessed his guilt, declaring that he had, in a sermon preached at S. Martin-in-the-Fields, uttered horrible blasphemies against Christ, and declared himself to be a heathen; after this confession, and an abjuration of all his errors made, the synod enjoined

[3] This Article was omitted when the Articles were published by royal authority.

[4] This Article was also disallowed by the queen, and omitted in the Articles published by royal authority.

him a penance, viz. never again to hold or teach such blasphemies, to attend on the preacher at Paul's Cross on the following Sunday, with a faggot on his shoulder, to recant his heresies in S. Martin's church during sermon, and never to preach or exercise the ministry again without the archbishop's special leave.

In the eleventh session seven articles were agreed upon by both houses, which received the royal assent.

1. That fit persons shall be admitted into holy orders and ecclesiastical benefices.

2. That, ordinarily, no pecuniary commutation of penance shall be permitted.

3. That caution be used in granting dispensations for marriages without publication of banns.

4. That sentences of excommunication be pronounced by an archbishop, bishop, dean, &c., or at least by one in holy orders.

5. Against pluralities.

6. Of fees to be taken by ecclesiastical officers and their servants.

7. That bishops make diligent enquiry concerning the clergy of their diocese; amongst other matters, the time when, and person by whom, they were admitted to holy orders, were to be enquired.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 552, and vol. i. p. 139. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 315.

London, 1586. LONDON. Held October 16, 1586, at St. Paul's, and adjourned to Westminster in the third session, held in November. Nothing of interest passed in the first twelve sessions; in the thirteenth, held December 2nd, the archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift) presented eight "orders for the better increase of learning in the inferior ministers, and for more diligent preaching and catechising." In the same session two schedules were brought from the lower house, one of which contained a complaint of disorderly proceedings in the diocese of Norwich. Amongst the heads of the complaint were the following:

1. That the canons were not observed.

2. That unworthy persons were ordained and instituted.

3. That penances were improperly commuted.

5. Excommunications denounced for trifles.

6. That no care was taken of the poor; and orderly preachers were discouraged, while disorderly ones were preferred.

The other schedule referred to the Suffolk archdeaconry particularly, and complained that,

1. The communion-book was not at all, or only in part, used and observed.

2. The wearing of the surplice was refused.

3. Holy days were not observed.

4. The communion was received by many sitting, and those who conformed to the Church were called "*time-servers.*"

5. Stipendiary preachers and curates were mutinous and disorderly.

6. Questmen were faulty in not presenting.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 559. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 320.

London, 1588.

LONDON. Held in November, 1588. In the twelfth session the archbishop admonished the beneficed clergy, that they should reside upon their livings, and earnestly entreated the lower house to unite with the bishops in affording the means of subsistence to two Romish priests named Tyrrell and Tydder, who had recanted at Paul's Cross in December in this year. In the fifteenth session, held March 19th, the archbishop introduced certain "orders," to be observed throughout the province; they are six in number, and refer to the residence of beneficed clergymen, to immoral and incompetent clerks, &c. On the second of April the synod was dissolved.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 570. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 335.

London, 1597.

LONDON. Held October 25th, 1597, at St. Paul's, archbishop Whitgift presiding. Twenty-nine sessions were held, in which twelve chapters or ecclesiastical constitutions were drawn up and received the royal assent.

1. That fit and proper persons should be admitted to holy orders and ecclesiastical benefices.

2. Restricts the granting of faculties for holding more than one benefice to learned men, holding the degree of M. A., and good preachers.

3. Orders that canons and prebendaries having benefices with cure of souls, shall not absent themselves from such benefices on plea of their cathedral duties beyond the necessary time, but shall study at home and take care of their parishioners, and support the poor.

4. Orders that the dean and canons shall, in their turn, preach in their cathedral.

5. Of caution to be used in granting dispensations of banns.

6. That sentences of divorce are not to be rashly pronounced.

7. Of excommunications.

8. That the ordinaries take care that recusants and excommunicated persons be publicly denounced, both in their parish church and in the cathedral of the diocese.

9. That ordinarily no pecuniary commutation of penance be allowed.

10. Of fees.

11. That the number of apparitors be restricted.

12. Of church registers; orders their safe custody; that the royal injunctions in this matter be carefully observed; that the register shall be made of parchment, and provided at the cost of the parishioners; that the names of persons christened, married, or buried, during the week, together with the respective dates, be read out, distinctly, by the minister on Sunday, after morning or evening prayer, to prevent fraud and errors; that both minister and churchwardens should sign their names at the bottom of each page; that the registers should be kept in a chest with three locks; that a copy be transmitted annually to the register of the bishop within a month after Easter.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 579; vol. i. p. 147. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 352.

London, 1604. LONDON. Convoked by king James I. to meet in S. Paul's cathedral, on the 20th of March, 1604. The see of Canterbury being vacant, Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, was commissioned to preside. Nothing was done until the fifth session, held April 13, when the bishop of London ordered the royal licence to be read, empowering the synod to draw up a code of canons. In the same session a deputation was sent to the speaker and other members of the house of commons, to answer certain charges preferred against the clergy, and to declare the complaints urged by the clergy against the laity. This, however, was subsequently referred to the upper house of parliament.

In the eleventh session, held May 2, the president delivered to the prolocutor of the lower house a book of canons, to be read and deliberated upon. The same day, three clerks, by name Egerton, Fleetwood, and Wotten, presented a petition to the lower house for a

reformation of the Anglican liturgy; the bishop of London, however, with the other prelates, admonished them to obey, and declare their assent to the liturgy as established, and appointed them the approaching feast of S. John Baptist on which to do so. In subsequent sessions the thirty-nine articles of 1562 were sent down by the king for the approval and subscription of the synod. Much debating took place as to the use of the sign of the cross in holy baptism (canon 30). Complaint was made by the prolocutor of a breach of privilege committed by two persons named Harrington and Walker, in serving two subpœnas upon him; they were punished, and sued for pardon.

In the twenty-fourth session, the book entitled "*Limbo-mastix*" was submitted to the council; this was a book by an anonymous author, pretending to show that "Christ descended not in soul to hell to deliver the fathers from thence;" it was dedicated to the parliament, and called upon that body to reform the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

In a subsequent session, the book of canons, known as the canons of 1604, which had been discussed through the previous sessions, was read and confirmed. These canons being in number one hundred and forty-one, were collected by bishop Bancroft out of the articles, injunctions, and synodal acts published in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth [5].

This new code was confirmed by the king's letters patent under the great seal, but its authority over the laity was warmly disputed, both in parliament and elsewhere. It seems to have been decided by the judges, that without the sanction of the legislature these canons are inoperative, except in the case of the clergy.

On the 6th March, 1606, the clergy of the province of York met in synod, and confirmed the canons agreed upon in this council of London.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 583; vol. i. p. 163—329. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 378.

LONDON. Held in November, 1605, under Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury. In the sixth session the archbishop produced the royal licence, empowering the synod to proceed to the enactment of ecclesiastical canons. In consequence forty-six canons

London, 1605.

[5] It seemed unnecessary to increase the bulk of this work by giving an analysis of these canons, which are so easily procurable.

London, 1605. (commonly known as those of bishop Overall's Convocation Book) were drawn up, and in a session held in the following year unanimously approved by both houses[6]. The royal assent, however, was expressly refused. The original book consists of three parts, two of them containing the canons and preparatory statements of facts and reasons; the third giving similar statements in connexion with the history of the papacy, thirteen in number, but not followed by any corresponding canons.

2. Denies that civil power and authority is derived from the people; affirms it to be God's ordinance.

3. Affirms that Adam and Eve after their fall, and all their posterity, are unable by their natural power to please God; that salvation cannot be had without faith in Christ.

4. Affirms that the Son of God, having from the first a Church on earth, did not leave mankind until the flood without priests and priestly authority.

5. Affirms the truth of the general deluge, and that all nations are descended from one of the sons of Noah.

6. Denies that the civil authority which Noah possessed after the flood was given unto him by his sons and nephews, and did not proceed from God.

7. Denies that the priestly power possessed by Noah after the flood, and by Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was conferred upon them by their children and nephews, and did not proceed from God.

8. Affirms that those of Noah's posterity who altered the manner or form of civil or ecclesiastical government so appointed by God, by framing for themselves a new kind of government or worship, did evil.

9. Affirms that the uniting of the children of Jacob into one nation, and the severing of the civil and ecclesiastical functions from Reuben the first-born, was not made by themselves.

10. Denies that the Israelites in Egypt were left by God destitute of such directions and instructions as were necessary for their civil or ecclesiastical estate, and that the people took upon them the appointing of heads of tribes, &c.

11. Affirms that the people of Israel were delivered out of Egypt by God's direction and power alone, and

[6] And subsequently by the convocation of the province of York.

not by their own; that they could not lawfully have left Egypt without Pharaoh's leave, except God had specially warranted it; denies that Moses and Joshua were chosen by the people. London, 1605.

12. Denies that the tribe of Levi, or Aaron and his posterity, were chosen to their offices by the people.

13. Affirms that God raised up judges to rule the Israelites after Joshua's death, without the consent of the people thereto; denies that the *fact* [*factum*] of the Sichemites may be imitated by Christians.

14. Denies that the people had any power in themselves to set up a king over them when they were so earnest with Samuel to make them a king, and that David was not as truly called to the kingdom by God Himself, as Aaron to the priesthood.

15. Affirms that the kings in the Old Testament were as strictly bound to observe God's laws as were Moses and the judges, and that they had authority by the example of Moses, &c. to appoint governors under them, without their government becoming therefore aristocratical, instead of truly monarchical.

16. Affirms that it was not more lawful in those times for subjects, for any cause, to bear arms against, or depose or kill their princes, than it would have been for children to have rebelled against or murdered their parents.

17. Denies that the calling of Moses, Aaron, Joshua, or any of the judges and kings, received any essential virtue or strength from the people, and affirms that the latter were bound to obey the heir apparent as their lawful king on the death of his predecessor.

18. Affirms that the priests in the Old Testament were subject to the civil authority and laws.

19. Denies that Adonijah was ever lawful king of the Israelites on account of the anointing of Abiathar, and that the anointing of Solomon by Zadoc conferred upon him any additional interest in his father's throne which he had not before by the ordinance of God and by his father's will; asserts that Zadoc was bound to anoint him at the command of David.

20. Affirms that kings and governors of Israel were as much bound to bring up their subjects in the true doctrine, as they were by the law of nature to make them keep the moral law; and that being so bound they had equal authority to compel all their subjects to

London, 1605.

observe the said laws as well of grace as of nature; that the institution of the priesthood did not prejudice the authority of kings and fathers to bring up their subjects and children in the fear of God, any more than grace did abrogate the commandment and the obedience of the law.

21. Affirms that godly princes in the Old Testament did exercise their authority in ecclesiastical matters.

22. Denies that Urijah was bound to build the altar as Ahaz commanded, and that the priests did wrong in rebuking king Uzziah; denies that they might lawfully have used violence against him, either in preventing him from burning incense, or compelling him, as a leper, to live apart; and that he was deprived of his kingdom either by the stroke of God in sending leprosy upon him, or by his so dwelling in a house apart; and that any priest before or after that time did forcibly resist or depose any of the kings of Israel or Judah, although many of them were idolaters.

23. Denies that the example of Jehoiada, or any thing else in the Old Testament, gave any authority to the high priest to dispute or determine whether the children of the kings of Judah should be kept from the crown, or deposed on account of their fathers having been idolaters.

24. Affirms that all the priests in the Old Testament were bound to obey God's directions, delivered unto them even by prophets of the tribe of Levi; and that the said priests might not punish false prophets, because they had maliciously persecuted some that were true.

25. Affirms that the true prophets did well in rebuking sharply their sovereigns, but that their example did not justify other men in doing so; that no one, without God's express command, might design or anoint other than the lawful successors to be kings, or do violence to the king's person.

26. Denies that the passage in Jeremiah i. 10, gave any authority to the high priests to give away kingdoms, or to depose their kings, however guilty.

27. Denies the murder of Eglon by *Ehud* gave any authority to subjects to murder their kings; and that the high priests and priests might have encouraged others, pretending God's command, to kill their kings, however wicked, or however much they judged it for the good of the kingdom or Church; affirms that a

man to be held justified in doing so, must first prove as clearly that God gave him authority to do it; as it is clear that God commanded Ehud. London, 1605.

28. Affirms that they do wickedly who shake off the yoke of obedience to their sovereigns, and set up a government for themselves; and that the fact of God having used such rebellions, &c., to work out his good purposes, by no means mitigates their wickedness. Affirms that governments begun by rebellion, when settled, are to be held as of God, and to be obeyed.

29. Affirms that the kings of Persia, after the Jewish restoration, being still, by God's appointment, rulers of the people, could not rightly be resisted. Affirms that Zerobabel and Nehemiah were lawful princes, although not elected by the people; and that the priests would have sinned grievously in not submitting to their rule in ecclesiastical causes.

30. Denies that the high priests, subsequent to the time of Zerobabel and Nehemiah, did lawfully bear the sway which they did, and that Jaddus, the high priest, did amiss in swearing obedience to Darius, &c.

31. Affirms that the Jews became the lawful subjects of Alexander, and could not lawfully bear arms against him; that they were bound to pray for, and to be faithful to the successive kings and kingdoms under whose subjection they lived.

32. Denies that the people were bound to obey the high priests, when they commanded things repugnant to the law of God.

33. Affirms that having submitted to the Roman government, they were bound thenceforth to obey it, and to pay tribute to, and to pray for, Cæsar, &c.

34. Denies that it was lawful for any to move the people to sedition, on account of anything done by the civil power which they liked not, and to refuse the oaths and taxes required by the Romans.

35. Affirms the Son of God to be the governor of all the world, and that all earthly governors are appointed and upheld by Him. Denies that He ever, after Adam's and Noah's time, committed the government of the world to any one man.

36. Affirms that the merits of Christ's death, then to come, were sufficient to save all true believers under the old dispensation; that there was then a Catholic Church; that many Gentiles were always members

of it, that Christ was the sole head of it; that Noah did not appoint any man to be the visible head of the Catholic Church; that the high priest amongst the Jews had no more authority over the Catholic Church than David had over the universal kingdom of God.

The abridgment of the canons of the first book, given above, will afford some idea of their nature; the ten canons contained in the second book, carrying on the same argument under the New Testament, are far too long for insertion in a work like the present, and from their form incapable of abridgment.

In the twelfth session a person called Cartwright, who had killed a clergyman, and received the king's pardon, sought pardon and absolution of the bishops; on account of some informality, his case was postponed. —*Cardwell*, vol. i. p. 330, vol. ii. p. 586. See also *Bp. Overall's Convocation Book.*

London, 1623. LONDON. In a convocation held in February, 1623, under George Abbot, archbishop, a complaint was brought in by the college of physicians against ministers exercising physic; it was ruled that no minister may practise physic except in his own parish, and then for charity only.

In this same synod the archbishop complained of the irregular conduct of the clergy.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 592. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 467.

London, 1640. LONDON. Held at S. Paul's, on the 14th day of April, 1640, by William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, who, habited in his cope and other pontifical vestments, and accompanied by his officials, was met at the north door of the cathedral by the dean and canons residentiary, and other ministers in their surplices, and conducted into the choir, the bishops of the province, in the customary vestments, accompanying him. After "Te Deum" had been sung in English, a sermon was preached by Thomas Turner, S.T.P., canon residentiary, who took for his text. S. Matt. x. 16.

A hymn having been chanted, the archbishop proceeded from the choir to the chapter-house, and took his seat, accompanied by the following bishops:—William of London, Walter of Winchester, John of Salisbury, Robert of Coventry and Lichfield, Godfrey of Gloucester, Joseph of Exeter, John of S. Asaph, William of Bath and Wells, John of Oxford, George of Hereford, Matthew of Ely, Robert of Bristol, William

of Bangor, John of Rochester, Brian of Chichester, John of Peterborough, Morgan of Llandaff. London, 1640.

After which the royal brief was read, and the clergy of the lower house instructed to elect their prolocutor.

The second session was held in Henry VII.'s chapel at Westminster; the archbishop and bishops being present as before. After prayer had been said, the election of Richard Steward, dean of Chichester, as procurator of the lower house, was approved; and a letter from the king, under the great seal, read, authorizing the synod to proceed to the enactment of certain constitutions relating to ecclesiastical matters, true religion, and the good of the Anglican Church. Session II. April 7.

In the third session a large subsidy to the king was proposed, and unanimously agreed to. Two chapters concerning the suppression of the Jesuits, priests, and others belonging to the Romish Church, were drawn up, and delivered to the prolocutor for consideration in the lower house. Session III. April 22.

In the fourth session Godfrey of Gloucester and John of Oxford were commissioned to act for the archbishop in his absence. Session IV. April 24.

In the following session a synodical act was made, forbidding any member of the convocation, under severe penalties, to make any disclosures out of the house concerning the proposed ecclesiastical canons. A form of prayer to Almighty God, in behalf of the parliament, which, at the king's command, had been drawn up by Dr. Bray and Dr. Oliver, was read, and ordered to be used in convocation daily, immediately before the blessing. Session V. April 25.

In the four sessions following nothing worthy of notice took place.

In the tenth session, after some conversation amongst the bishops about the insecurity of the times, and the tumultuous and violent conduct of the lower orders in London and the neighbourhood, the king's licence under the great seal was read, renewing the authority which he had granted to them to draw up and enact canons and constitutions concerning ecclesiastical matters; after which the lower house having been recommended by the archbishop to appoint a committee out of their own body for the framing and consideration of such constitutions, returned the names of fourteen persons whom they had elected for that purpose. The arch- Session X. May 13.

London, 1640. bishop also proposed that a pontifical or book of ecclesiastical rites, for the use of the Anglican Church, should be drawn up, containing, besides the form of confirmation, and of consecrating bishops and ordering of priests and deacons, already in force, the form and manner of his majesty's coronation, another form for the consecration of churches and churchyards, and a third for reconciling such penitents as either had done open penance, or who had turned Mahometans; this design, however, came to nothing.

Session XI. May 15. In the following session Sir Henry Vane, knight, appeared with a message from the king, and having been seated on the archbishop's left hand, he declared the king's will that they should proceed as quickly as possible to the enactment of such canons and constitutions as the present wants of the Church required, and that none of them should leave the synod until all their business was finished.

Session XII. May 16. On Saturday, May 16 (session twelve), the prolocutor brought up to the bishops certain canons which had been agreed upon in the lower house; after which the archbishop discoursed upon the injury done to the poorer clergy by those who deprived them of the oblations and fees for churching women, marrying, and burying, and also upon the great injury done to the clergy by the laity electing parish-clerks and guardians, who disturbed and opposed them, to their great prejudice and wrong; whereupon by a vote of the house, it was agreed to signify the matter to the king's attorney-general, and to request him to apply some remedy. A benevolence to the king was also agreed to by both houses.

In the six following sessions the synod was employed in the consideration of the canons proposed. In the 19th session, Godfrey, bishop of Gloucester, declared that he should refuse his consent to the canons proposed to be enacted, on the plea that the synod itself was unlawful. After this, the houses were employed through three sessions in framing the canons, and in the 23rd session (May 27th) the archbishop informed both houses that the canons agreed upon in the sacred synod had been read before the king and before the privy council, and unanimously approved, and that his majesty had commissioned him to express his thanks to both houses for the great pains and labour which they

London, 1640.

Session XXVI. May 29.

had bestowed upon the work. Other canons were subsequently proposed and agreed to, and in the last session, held May 29th, the whole book, containing seventeen chapters of canons, was produced and read aloud by the archbishop, after which it was subscribed by him and all the other bishops (with the exception of the bishop of Gloucester), and by all the members of the lower house. The bishop of Gloucester was then thrice required by the archbishop to subscribe, and having each time refused to do so, it was decreed by the majority of prelates that he should, for his contumacy and disobedience, be deprived, whereupon he offered to sign, and in fact did so, but still refused to declare that he had signed voluntarily and without equivocation. Sentence of suspension was then passed upon him by the unanimous vote of both houses.

1. Concerning the regal power.

Enacts that every parson, vicar, curate, or preacher, shall, under pain of suspension, on four Sundays in each year, at morning prayer, read certain explanations of the regal power, to the effect:—

(1) That the sacred order of kings is of Divine right, that a supreme power is given by God in Scripture to kings to rule all persons civil and ecclesiastical.

(2) That the care of God's Church is committed to kings in the Scripture.

(3) That the power to call and dissolve national and provincial councils within their own territories is the true right of princes.

(4) That it is treason against God and the prince for any other to set up any independent co-active power, either papal or popular, within the prince's territory.

(5) That subjects who resist their natural prince by force resist God's ordinance, and shall receive damnation.

(6) That as tribute is due from subjects to their prince, so those subjects have not only possession of, but a true and just title to, all their goods and estates; that as it is the duty of subjects to supply their king, so is it his duty to defend them in their property.

Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all persons to preach or teach any thing contrary to the tenor of these explanations.

2. For the better keeping of the day of his majesty's most happy inauguration.

London, 1640.

Orders all persons to keep the morning of the said day in coming diligently to church, and that due inquiry be made by bishops and others as to how the day is observed, in order that offenders may be punished.

3. For suppressing the growth of popery.

Orders all ecclesiastical persons, bishops, &c., having exempt or peculiar jurisdiction, and all officials, and others having the cure of souls, to confer privately with the parties, and by Church censures, &c., to reduce those who are misled into popish superstition to the Church of England.

Such private conferences to be performed by the bishop himself, or by some one or more persons of his appointment.

The said ecclesiastical persons to inform themselves of all persons, above the age of twelve years, in every parish, who do not come to church, or receive the holy eucharist, and who say or hear mass.

Ministers, churchwardens, &c., to present all such persons.

If neither private conferences nor Church censures will avail with such offenders, their names shall be certified by the bishop of the diocese unto the justices of assize.

Marriages, burials, and christenings of recusants, celebrated otherwise than according to the form of the Church of England, to be declared by churchwardens and others at visitations.

Diligent enquiry to be made as to who are employed as schoolmasters of the children of recusants. Churchwardens to give upon oath the names of those who send their children to be brought up abroad.

4. Against Socinianism.

Forbids any one to print, sell, or buy any book containing Socinian doctrines upon pain of excommunication, and orders all ordinaries to signify the names of offenders to the metropolitan, in order to be by him delivered to the king's attorney-general, that proceedings may be taken against them.

No preacher to vent such doctrine in a sermon, under pain of excommunication, and for a second offence deprivation. No university student or person in holy orders, except graduates in divinity, to have any Socinian book in his possession; all books so found to be burned; diligent inquiry to be made after offenders.

5. Against sectaries. London, 1640.

Declares that all the enactments of the canon against popish recusants shall, as far as they are applicable, stand in full force against all Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, and other sects.

That the clauses in the canons against Socinianism, referring to Socinian books, shall stand in full force against all books devised against the discipline and government of the Church of England.

Orders all church and chapel wardens and quest men to present at visitations the names of those disaffected persons who neglected the prayers of the church, and came in for sermon only, thinking thereby to avoid the penalties enacted against such as wholly absented themselves.

6. An oath enjoined for the preventing of all innovations in doctrine and government.

Declares that all archbishops, bishops, and all other priests and deacons shall, to secure them against suspicion of popery or other superstition, take the oath which it prescribes.

Offenders after three months' delay granted them, if they continue obstinate, to be deprived.

Orders that the following shall also be compelled to take the prescribed oath, viz. all masters of arts, bachelors and doctors in divinity, law, or physic, all licensed practitioners of physic, all registrars, proctors, and schoolmasters, all graduates of foreign universities who come to be incorporated into an English university, and all persons about to be ordained or licensed to preach or serve any cure.

7. A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies.

Declares the standing of the communion table sideways under the East window of every chancel or chapel, to be in its own nature indifferent, and that therefore no religion is to be placed therein, or scruple to be made thereof.

That although at the Reformation all popish altars were demolished, yet it was ordered by queen Elizabeth's injunction, that the holy tables should stand where the altars stood, and that, accordingly, they have been so continued in the royal chapels, most cathedrals, and some parish churches, that all churches and chapels should conform to the example of the

London, 1640.

cathedral mother churches in this particular, saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by law during the time of administration of the holy communion. Declares that this situation of the holy table does not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is, and may be, by us called an altar in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar.

Orders that in order to prevent profane abuses of the communion table, it shall be railed in.

Orders that at the words "draw near," &c., all communicants shall with all humble reverence approach the holy table.

Recommends to all good and well affected members of the Church, that they do reverence and obeisance both at their coming in and going out of the church, chancel, or chapel, according to the custom of the primitive Church and the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth.

8. Of preaching for conformity.

Orders all preachers, under pain of suspension, to instruct the people in their sermons twice a year at least, that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England are lawful and commendable, and to be submitted to.

9. One Book of Articles of inquiry to be used at all parochial visitations.

Declares that the synod had caused a summary or collection of visitatory articles (out of the rubrics of the service book and the canons and warrantable rules of the Church), to be made and deposited in the records of the archbishop of Canterbury, and that no bishop or other ordinary shall, under pain of suspension, cause to be printed, or otherwise to be given in charge to the churchwardens or others which shall be sworn to make presentments, any other articles or forms of inquiry upon oath, than such as shall be approved by his metropolitan.

10. Concerning the conversation of the clergy.

Charges all clergymen carefully to abstain from all excess and disorder, and that by their Christian and religious conversation they shine forth as lights to others in all godliness and honesty.

Requires all to whom the government of the clergy

is committed, to set themselves to countenance godliness, and diligently to labour to reform their clergy where they require it. London, 1640.

11. Chancellor's patents.

Forbids bishops to grant any patent to any chancellor, commissary, or official, for longer than the life of the grantee, nor otherwise than with the reservation to himself and his successors of the power to execute the said place, either alone or with the chancellor, if the bishop shall please to do so; forbids, under the heaviest censures, to take any reward for such places.

12. Chancellors alone not to censure any of the clergy in sundry cases.

All cases involving suspension or any higher censure to be heard by the bishop or by his chancellor, together with two grave, dignified, or beneficed ministers of the diocese.

13. Excommunication and absolution not to be pronounced but by a priest.

No excommunications or absolutions to be valid, unless pronounced by the bishop, or by some priest appointed by the bishop; such sentence of absolution to be pronounced either in open consistory, or, at least, in a church or chapel, the penitent humbly craving it on his knees.

14. Concerning commutations and the disposing of them.

No chancellor or other to commute penance without the bishop's privity; or if by himself, he shall render strict account of the moneys received, which shall be applied to charitable and public uses.

15. Touching concurrent jurisdiction.

That in places wherein there is concurrent jurisdiction, no executor be *cited* into any court or office for the space of ten days after the death of the testator.

16. Concerning licences to marry.

No licence shall be granted by any ordinary to any parties, except one of the parties have been living in the jurisdiction of the said ordinary for one month immediately before the licence be desired.

17. Against vexatious citations.

No citations grounded only upon pretence of a breach of law, and not upon presentment or other just ground, shall issue out of any ecclesiastical court, except under certain specified circumstances, and except in cases of

London, 1640. grievous crime, such as schism, incontinence, misbehaviour in Church, &c.

These canons were ratified by the king under the great seal, June 30th, 1640, and therefore have the same force with the canons of 1604. It is true that an attempt was made at the time to set aside their authority, upon the plea that convocation could not lawfully continue its session after the dissolution of parliament, which took place on the 5th of May; but the opinion of all the judges taken at the time was unanimously in favour of the legality of their proceeding, as appears by the following document:—

"The convocation being called by the king's writ under the great seal, doth continue until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved.

"14th May, 1640. "Jo. Finch.
"C. S. H. Manchester.
"John Bramston.
"Edward Littleton.
"Ralphe Whitfield.
"Jo. Bankes.
"Ro. Heath."

An act of parliament, passed in the thirteenth year of Charles II. leaves to these canons their full canonical authority, whilst it provides that nothing contained in that statute shall give them the force of an act of parliament.

The acts of this convocation were unanimously confirmed by the synod of York.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 593, vol. i. p. 380. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 538.

London, 1661. LONDON. Held at S. Paul's, May 8th, 1661, by William Juxon, archbishop of Canterbury; Gilbert, bishop of London, acting as his *locum tenens*. After the customary solemnities, and a sermon, by Thomas Pierce, S.T.P., the bishops left the choir and assembled in the chapter-house of the cathedral, viz. Gilbert of London, Matthew of Ely, William of Bath and Wells, Robert of Oxford, John of Rochester, Henry of Chichester, George of Worcester, Homfrey of Salisbury, Benjamin of Peterborough, Edward of Norwich, Nicholas of Hereford, and William of Gloucester. The archbishop's letter and the royal brief were then read, and the lower house declared that they had elected Henry Fearne, S.T.P., to be their prolocutor.

In the second session, held at Westminster, the same bishops being present, with the exception of Nicholas, bishop of Hereford, together with the bishops of S. Asaph and S. David's; the bishops of Ely, Oxford, Peterborough, and Salisbury, together with eight members of the lower house, were commissioned to draw up a form of prayer to be used annually on the anniversary of the king's birthday, and of his happy restoration to his kingdom; also the bishops of Rochester, Chichester, Worcester, and Norwich, together with eight members of the lower house, were commissioned to prepare a form of prayer to be used on the 30th day of January. London, 1661. Session II. May 6.

In the following session the bishop of Ely delivered the form of prayer for the king's birthday and restoration; after which the bishops of Salisbury, Peterborough, and S. Asaph, together with six clerks of the lower house, were appointed to draw up a form for the baptism of adults. Session III. May 13.

In the seventh session the form for adult baptism was presented by the bishop of Salisbury, and unanimously approved. Session VII. May 31.

In the following session, the royal licence, under the great seal, was presented by Richard Aldworth, esquire, empowering the convocation to correct and amend existing canons, and to enact fresh ones; subsequently the attorney-general's proclamation, addressed to the bishops, concerning a fast to be observed on the 12th of the month, was read, and four bishops appointed to draw up the requisite form of prayer. Session VIII. June 7.

In the tenth session the king's letters patent were read, authorizing the convocation, or the greater part of them, (the bishop of London, or Ely, or Bath and Wells, always to be one,) to propose, confer, treat, debate, &c., upon the exposition or alteration of any existing canon, and to make new canons; upon which twelve bishops, and twenty-four members of the lower house, were chosen to proceed with the business, to meet at the Savoy twice a-week until it was completed. Session X. June 19.

In the eleventh session the archbishop of York and the bishops of Durham and Chester were present; six bishops were nominated to draw up a book of visitation articles, and the bishops of Durham, Carlisle, and Chester were requested to assist them. Session XI. June 21.

In the twenty-fifth session, the king's letter to the Session XXV. Nov. 21.

London, 1661. archbishop of Canterbury, under his private seal, was read, granting to the convocation liberty and authority to enter upon a revision of the book of common prayer, whereupon the bishops of Durham, Ely, Oxford, Rochester, Salisbury, Worcester, Lincoln, and Gloucester, were unanimously chosen to revise the Prayer-book, which revision occupied the following twenty-three sessions; and in the forty-eighth session, held December 20th, the revised prayer-book having been already approved and subscribed by the primate, was unanimously received and subscribed by the bishops and members of the lower house.

In the following sessions the revision of the canons was continued, and certain alterations made in the book of common prayer by the parliament were submitted to the consideration of the synod and revised; also a book of visitation articles, drawn up by the bishop of Durham, was presented and unanimously received, and referred to the primate. Dr. Sancroft was appointed to superintend, and Messrs. Scattergood and Dillingham to correct, the printing of the book of common prayer.

Session LXX. March 18. 1662. The bishop of London, in the seventieth session, announced to both houses that the revised copy of the prayer-book had been graciously received by the house of lords, and that the lord chancellor, in his own name, and in that of the whole house, had testified his thanks to the bishops and members of the lower house of convocation, for the great care and pains which they had bestowed upon the work.

In the seventy-eighth session it was enacted, that no ordination should be held by any bishop except at the four Ember seasons. In that held on the 26th of April, John Earle, dean of Westminster, and John Peirson, S.T.P., were appointed to translate the revised book of common prayer into the Latin tongue. Nothing especially requiring notice was transacted in the following sessions, except, that in the one hundred and fortieth session, the president charged all the prelates present to use all diligence that every rector, vicar, and minister in their respective dioceses, should, in their surplices, read prayers according to the order described in the revised copy of the book of common prayer, *without any omission in any part of it.*—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 631. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 570.

LONDON. Held November 25th, 1710, under Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury. The heads of business to be transacted, by the queen's direction, were as follows :— London, 1710.

1. To draw up a representation of the state of religion in the country, with regard to the late excessive growth of infidelity and heresy.

2. To regulate matters concerning excommunication.

3. To prepare a form for the visitation of prisoners, and for admitting converts from the Church of Rome.

4. To establish rural deans where they were not, and increase their efficiency where they already exist.

5. To make provision for more exact terriers.

6. To consider the regulation of licences for marriage.

But the most important matter treated of in this synod was that of Whiston, whose book, entitled "An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity," and dedicated to the archbishop and convocation, was (March 16th) formally presented by the lower house to the notice of the prelates, declaring, that in their judgment, it contained assertions opposed to the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, and praying the bishops to consider in what manner the synod ought to proceed on the occasion.

On the 19th of March, the bishops came to the resolution that some notice should be taken of the book, and submitted the matter to the archbishop of Canterbury for consideration, who, in April, addressed a letter to the house, expressing some doubt about the extent of the power possessed by convocation in such a matter. Accordingly, on the 22nd of April, a humble address was sent by the bishops to the queen, setting forth, that whereas William Whiston, a presbyter of the Church of England, who had been expelled in the preceding October from the university of Cambridge for teaching erroneous doctrines, had since advanced certain damnable and blasphemous assertions against the doctrine and worship of the ever-blessed Trinity, defaming the whole Athanasian creed, the convocation were anxious to call him before them, in order to his amendment or correction. That they, nevertheless, were hindered in so doing from some doubt concerning their power so to act, and that they consequently entreated her majesty to lay the case before the judges for their opinion how far

London, 1710. the convocation would be justified, in law, in proceeding to examine and condemn such tenets as are declared to be heresy by the laws, together with the maintainers of them.

The opinions of the twelve judges appear to have been divided, eight of them, together with the attorney and solicitor-general (Northey and Raymond), decided that the convocation possessed by law the necessary powers, whilst four of them gave a contrary opinion. Notwithstanding this want of unanimity, the queen declared to the synod that there was no doubt of their jurisdiction, and directed them to proceed in the matter, which they did, and shortly published their judgment, in which they set forth certain passages out of Whiston's writings; and having declared them to contain false and heretical assertions injurious to our Saviour and the Holy Spirit, repugnant to Holy Scripture, and contrary to the decrees of the two first general councils, and to the Liturgy and articles of the Anglican Church, they earnestly beseech all Christian people to take heed how they give ear to such false teaching.

They moreover notice the assertion made by Whiston concerning the "apostolical constitutions," which he pretended to be a part of the canon of Scripture, and even superior to the received Epistles of the Apostles, and they declare his assertion to be highly absurd and impious.

This censure was presented to the queen, but the royal assent was never given to it, and Whiston thus escaped without any synodical censure. On the 12th of June, 1711, the synod was prorogued.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 724. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. iv. p. 638.

London. 1711. LONDON. Held in December, 1711, in which a declaration was proposed to be made, setting forth the irregularity of lay-baptism, but declaring the validity of all baptism in or with water in the name of the blessed Trinity. Sharp, archbishop of York, refused to sign it, and it was sent with the signatures of archbishop Tenison and most of the bishops of his province to the members of the lower house, who would not so much as take it into consideration.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 770, note.

London, 1714. LONDON. Held in 1714, in which (June 2,) a petition was sent by the lower house to the bishops, in which they most earnestly beseech their lordships to

take into consideration a book entitled *The Scriptural Doctrine of the Trinity*, by Dr. Samuel Clarke. The bishops having requested them to forward to them such passages as they considered to be heretical, on the 23rd of June the lower house sent up a list of passages extracted from Dr. Clarke's book. On the 2nd July, Clarke put in a declaration in defence, in which he professes to believe in the co-eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit with the Father, and expresses sorrow for the offence his book had given, declaring at the same time his purpose never to write again on the subject of the blessed Trinity. With this declaration the bishops professed themselves to be satisfied, and ceased all further proceedings against him.

In this convocation a form was drawn up "for admitting converts from the Church of Rome;" also an exhortation was agreed upon, to be read in Church to persons about to be excommunicated.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 785. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 657.

LONDON. Held in March, 1715, under archbishop Tenison. A form of consecrating churches, chapels, and churchyards, was drawn up, but never confirmed.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 816. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 668. London, 1715.

LONDON. Held in 1717, under William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1717.

On the 3rd of May, a representation was made by the lower house to the archbishop and bishops about the sermon of Hoadley, bishop of Bangor, on the kingdom of Christ, in which they declare the tendency of the doctrines and positions contained in the said sermon to be:—

1. To subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ.

2. To impugn the regal supremacy in causes ecclesiastical.

They then proceed to give extracts from the sermon, with remarks upon them at some length.

Before the representation could be brought before the bishops, the king (George I.) thought fit to prorogue the convocation by special order, and up to the present time it has not again been allowed to enter upon any business.—*Cardwell*, vol. ii. p. 828. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iv. p. 672.

Lorris, 843. LORRIS. [*Concilium apud Lauriacum.*] Held in October, 843. Four canons only were published.

1. Anathematizes those who despise ecclesiastical authority.

2. Anathematizes those who conspire in any way against the royal dignity.

3. Anathematizes those who refuse to obey the king.

4. Anathematizes those who violate these canons.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1790.

Lucca, 1062. LUCCA. [*Concilium Luccense.*] Held in 1062, by pope Alexander II., who presided. The case of Eritta, abbess of the monastery of S. Justina, at Lucca, was examined. She was accused of having introduced a clerk into her monastery, and of having had improper intercourse with him. Eritta was called into the assembly, and the charge carefully sifted and examined, when it proved to be groundless and calumnious. Her innocence being thus fully established, the women who had urged the accusation against her were, according to the canon, sentenced to receive the same punishment which would have been awarded her had she been found guilty, viz. they were dismissed from their convent and shut up in prison.—*Mansi, Supp. Coll. Conc.* Tom. i. col. 1367.

Lucca, 1308. LUCCA. Held about 1308, under Henry, bishop of the diocese, seventy-seven articles of regulation were published, many of which are entirely lost, and some partially. Amongst those which we have may be noticed the following :—

6. Directs that the host and chalice be incensed at mass.

9. Regulates the dress of ecclesiastics.

17. Is directed against those who being illegitimate have obtained orders by deceit, and against other abuses.

24. Forbids, on pain of suspension, a clerk to keep with him in his house any woman except his mother or aunt.

28. Excommunicates every ecclesiastic guilty of usury.

33. Forbids chapters, under pain of excommunication, to augment the prebends during the vacancy of the bishopric.

34. Forbids to elect to any ecclesiastical dignity a man ignorant of letters.

38. Prohibits the clergy to play at any game of dice within their own diocese.

39. Orders that those clerks should pay a fine who by any sign or gesture shall show disrespect to God or the saints.

40. Forbids the clergy to carry arms in the environs of their residence.

52. Excommunicates those who oppose the execution of the last wishes of the dying.

55. Excommunicates those who do violence to churches, tombs, religious persons, &c.

56. Not only prohibits usury, but forbids to hire a house of an usurer.

57. Orders that all the faithful, of fifteen years of age complete, shall make annual confession.

68. Directs that medical men shall warn the sick to take care of their spiritual sickness rather than that of the body.

65. Orders the residence of beneficed clerks.

58. Forbids all clerks to sell or cause to be sold, bread or wine in the houses appertaining to their churches, or even in any other without the bishop's special permission.

70. Forbids to absolve a public usurer even in death, except he will give security that he will make restitution of his usurious gains.

72. Forbids all assemblies of clergy except those made according to the will of the bishop.

76. Excommunicates those who intercept or tear, or in any way offer indignity to the letters of bishops.—*Mansi, Suppl.* Tom. iii. col. 307, &c.

LUGO. [*Concilium Lucense.*] Two councils were held at Lugo; one by king Theodomir, in 569, in which the division of Spain into dioceses and parishes was effected, and their respective limits assigned. Lugo, in Spain, 569 and 572.

Another in 572, when eighty-four chapters or canons, sent by S. Martin, bishop of Braga, were read. These canons were chiefly taken from the Greek code, to which he added several made from Latin synods.—*Baronius.* Tom. v. Conc. pp. 875 and 902.

LYONS. [*Concilium Lugdunense.*] Held about the year 197, by S. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, in which the decree was confirmed, which settled that the celebration of Easter-day should take place on the Sunday following Lyons, about 197.

the 14th day of the March moon. A letter was written by S. Irenæus to Victor of Rome, in which he exhorted him to follow the example of his predecessors, and not to refuse communion with the Quartodecimani. [See C. Nicea.]—Tom. i. Conc. p. 598. *Baluze.*

Lyons, 199. LYONS. Two years after, viz. about 199, another council was held by S. Irenæus, against the Valentinian heresy and the Marcionists.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 599.

Lyons, 517. LYONS. Held in 517. Viventiolus (or Avitus), bishop of Lyons, presided at the head of ten bishops. A man named Stephen was condemned and excommunicated in this council, for an incestuous marriage with Palladia, his deceased wife's sister. Six statutes were drawn up.

The first and the last relate to the case of Stephen mentioned above.

The fourth forbids all intermeddling on the part of the bishops with the concerns of other Churches.

The fifth forbids to aspire to any bishopric during the life-time of the actual bishop, and pronounces sentence of perpetual excommunication against those who are consecrated under such circumstances, and all who are concerned in such consecration.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1584.

Lyons, 567. LYONS. Held in 567, by order of king Guntram. The archbishops of Lyons and Vienne presiding. Fourteen prelates, eight in person and six by deputy, attended. Salonius, bishop of Embrum, and another were condemned, and six canons published.

1. Orders that the differences between bishops of the same province shall be settled by the metropolitan and other bishops of the province; but if the dispute be between two bishops of different provinces, the two metropolitans shall settle it.

4. Enacts that no one excommunicated by his bishop shall be received into communion until he be absolved.

6. Orders that Litanies shall be said in all churches and parishes in the first week in September, as well as in that before Ascension-day.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 847.

Lyons, 583. LYONS. Held in 583, under king Guntram; Priscus, archbishop of Lyons, presiding; eight bishops and the deputies of twelve others were present; six canons were published, one of which enacts that bishops shall not

celebrate the festivals of Christmas and Easter out of their own churches, except in case of sickness, or by the king's order.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 973.

LYONS. Held in 1055, by Hildebrand, cardinal and legate of Victor II. In this council an archbishop accused of simony, who could not pronounce the name of the Holy Spirit before the assembly, was deposed: and several other bishops, moved by this miracle, confessed the same sin and voluntarily resigned their sees. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1080. *Fleuri. Pet. Dam. Opusc.* Lyons, 1055.

LYONS. Held in 1245, by pope Innocentius IV. The causes which led to its convocation were the following: Gregory IX. had excommunicated the emperor Frederick, deposed him from the imperial dignity, and released his subjects from their oath of allegiance. The solemn publication of this sentence was made on Holy Thursday, 1239. The apparent cause of the pope's anger against the emperor was the non-fulfilment of a vow made by the latter in sickness, to proceed to the aid of the Holy Land. After the death of Gregory, Innocentius IV. convoked this council of Lyons, to which he invited all Christian princes, and at the same time cited the emperor to appear. Lyons, 1245, falselystyled Thirteenth Œcumenical.

At the time appointed for the meeting of the council, the bishops assembled, to the number of about 140 (including archbishops and bishops); amongst them were the three Latin patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia; Baldwin, emperor of Constantinople, and Raymond, count of Toulouse, were also present.

Besides the prelates who were present, deputies were sent by many of those who were absent, and from several chapters; amongst them was one from the abbey of S. Alban's, in England.

In a congregation held before the first session, the ambassador of Frederick made ample offers to conciliate the pope, declaring his willingness to oppose the Tartars, the Corasmians, the Saracens, or any other enemies of the Church, or to go, at his own expense, to deliver the Holy Land from the hands of the infidels: all these offers were, however, rejected by the pope on the plea that no faith could be given to the emperor's professions.

The pope having on his right hand the emperor of Constantinople, made a speech concerning the irregularities of the bishops and people, the insolence of the Session I. June 28.

Lyons, 1245. Saracens, and the Greek schism, the cruelties of the Tartars, and the evil conduct of the emperor Frederic towards his predecessor Gregory.

Frederick's ambassador, Thaddeus of Suepia, in his answer most eloquently defended his master, and showed that the emperor was no longer bound by his promises, the pope having himself failed on his part to perform his engagements.

Session II. July 5. In the second session several bishops, especially the Spaniards, spoke with great warmth against the emperor, and demanded his condemnation, but were shortly answered by Thaddeus. In the end a delay of twelve days was given him in which to appear.

Session III. July 17 or 18. In the third, it was decreed that the octave of the festival of the nativity of the blessed Virgin should be observed. Ten articles of regulation were drawn up, relating chiefly to judicial proceedings. The pope ordered that succour should be provided for the empire of Constantinople, and that a part of the revenue of all the benefices should be appropriated to that purpose.

Further, the English ambassadors, Hugo Bigod, William de Chanteloup, and Philip Basset, in the name of the whole kingdom, presented a written complaint relating to two grievances: First, "That king John had, contrary to the will of his people, made a donation of the kingdom of Ireland to the pope, which act they maintained to be altogether null and void. And second, That the most insupportable exactions were made by the legates, nuncios, and other ministers, whom the pope sent into England." In the letter which they presented to the council, it was set forth that the predecessors of Innocentius, wishing to enrich the Italians, had presented them to benefices of which they took no sort of care, that they totally neglected the cure of souls, and the duties of hospitality and almsgiving; in short, that they thought only of enjoying the revenues of their preferments, and of carrying them out of the kingdom, to the great prejudice of the native clergy who ought to have possessed these benefices.

It stated that the sum thus carried out of England by these Italians amounted to more than 60,000 silver marks; and that in spite of these enormous exactions, the legate Martin, whom the pope had sent into England, was endeavouring to push matters further, and to dispose of other preferments in the same way, by reserv-

ing them for the disposal of the holy see when vacant ; that he impoverished the monks by his excessive demands upon them, and lavished excommunications and interdicts upon all who attempted to oppose his proceedings ; that it was impossible to believe that he had the pope's sanction for so doing, and that they consequently implored the latter to take steps to check him. Lyons, 1245.

When the reading of this letter was finished, all the bishops present maintained a deep silence ; and the pope, being embarrassed, merely replied, that the question required mature consideration[7]. Thaddeus then declared, that as the pope persisted in the proceedings against his master, he appealed to an œcumenical council. Then Innocentius, after asserting the present council to be œcumenical, pronounced against Frederick sentence of excommunication and deposition, depriving him of his kingdom, absolving all his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and threatening with excommunication all persons whatever who should give him help or counsel. The crimes imputed to this prince, as set forth in the sentence, were perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and felony. It is to be remarked, that the heading of this sentence does not state, in the usual form, that the sentence was passed *with the approbation* of the council, but simply, that it was done in *the presence* of the council ; in fact, the prelates, there is reason to believe, took no share in the matter.

Seventeen other decrees were published.

1 and 2. Of rescripts.

3. Of elections.

4. Of the office and power of a judge-delegate.

5 and 6. Of judgments, &c.

7. Of contumacious persons.

8. Of rescripts.

9. Of those who are put into possession *causa rei servandæ*.

10. Of confessions.

11. Of appeals, &c.

12. Of sentences of excommunication.

13. Of usurers.

14. Of aid to be given to the empire of Constantinople.

15. That prelates admonish their people as to the disposal of their property.

[7] According to Matthew Paris, the pope neither raised his eyes nor uttered a word, but "preserved a strict silence."

16. Of the Tartars.
17. Of the crusade.

This council was not received by the eastern Church; and the question of its being œcumenical is disputed still amongst those of the Roman Church [8].—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 633.

Lyons, 1274. falsely styled Fourteenth Œcumenical.

LYONS. Convoked by Gregory X. of Rome, and held in 1274. Five hundred Latin bishops, seventy abbots, and about one thousand other ecclesiastics attended [9]. The council was held in the metropolitan church of S. John. The pope himself presided in full pontifical robes, assisted by several cardinals. The two Latin patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch had seats in the middle of the church; on one side sat the cardinal-bishops, amongst whom were S. Bonaventura and Peter bishop of Ostia; and on the other side, the cardinal-priests; then the other prelates in order. There were also present ambassadors from France, England, Germany, Sicily, &c., the grand-masters of the Hospitallers and Templars, and the deputies of chapters.

Session I. May 7.

In the first session, after the usual prayer, the pope delivered a kind of sermon to the assembly, in which he explained the causes which had led to the convocation of the council: viz. the need of succour for the Holy Land, the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches, and the reformation of morals.

Between the first and second sessions, the pope obtained from the bishops and abbots the grant of a tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues.

Session II. May 18.

In the second session were published certain constitutions concerning the faith, and the deputies of chapters, abbots, and other inferior prelates were discharged from attendance.

Session III. June 7.

In the third session twelve constitutions were published, relating to the election of bishops, the ordination of the clergy, and the moral conduct, &c. of the clergy generally.

Session IV. July 6.

In the fourth session the ambassadors of the emperor, Michael Palæologus, were present, viz. Germanus, formerly patriarch of Constantinople, Theophanus of

[8] The privilege of wearing the red hat was first granted to the cardinals in this council.—*Nich. de Curbio, in Vitâ Inn*, c. xxii.

[9] The numbers present are very variously stated; one writer declares that they amounted altogether to 160,000, which, as Mansi truly observes, "*vix credibile est.*"

Nicea, George Acropolita, and many other persons of rank. The pope laid before them the three chief objects of the convocation of the council. The letter of the emperor was read, containing the profession of faith sent seven years before to him by Clement IV. "This faith," the emperor writes, "we recognise as the true catholic and orthodox faith, and we promise to hold it inviolably, only we desire that our Church may repeat the creed as she did before the schism, and may retain her own customs." After this, a letter from thirty-five Greek bishops was read, expressing their anxiety for unity, and recognizing the primacy of Rome. This done, George Acropolita, in the name of the emperor, took an oath, by which he abjured the schism, received the Roman confession of faith, and recognized the primacy of the Roman see. Te Deum and the Creed having been chanted in Latin, the patriarch and the other Greek ecclesiastics also chanted them in Greek, the word "Filioque" being chanted twice over. Lyons, 1274.

In the fifth session fourteen constitutions were published; of these, one relates to the election of the Roman pontiff; others enact that persons who have married twice shall be shut out from the enjoyment of every ecclesiastical privilege; that usurers shall not be permitted in any Christian country; that nothing unbecoming the place shall be allowed in any church; that all things necessary and proper to excite piety, &c. shall be provided in them; that during divine service, at the name of Jesus every one shall bow the head; that they shall be censured who do not abstain from the company of excommunicated persons. And on the following day, in the sixth and last session, two others were drawn up, one of which was for the purpose of checking the multitude of religious orders; the other is lost. After which the pope addressed the assembly, saying, that as to the other objects proposed by holding the council, viz. the reformation of morals, if the bishops would correct themselves, it would be unnecessary to draw up any new constitutions upon the subject in council; that he was astonished at the conduct of some who persisted in an irregular course of life, and declared that if they did not correct their way of living, he would himself visit their conduct with severity, adding that the prelates were the cause of the depravity of the world; he also promised to remedy Session V. July 16. Session VI. July 17.

Lyons, 1274. various other abuses; which promise, however, he forgot to perform. The affairs of the Holy Land were also discussed. The pope afterwards caused a collection of the constitutions made in this council to be drawn up in thirty-one articles, which were inserted in the text of the decretals.

1. Declares the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, as from one principle and by one only spiration.

2. Relates to elections to the papacy.

3. Directs that those who oppose any election shall give their reasons in their letter of appeal, and forbids them to bring forward others afterwards.

4—12. Relate to elections, &c.

13. Declares the collation of persons under twenty-five years of age to benefices to be null and void; obliges residence, and orders that all holders of benefices shall take priests' orders within a year from their preferment.

14. Orders that no one be preferred who is not of the canonical age.

15. Suspends from the power of ordaining, those bishops who shall have ordained clerks belonging to another diocese.

18. Forbids pluralities.

21. Moderates the Clementine about vacant livings in the court of Rome, the collation of which belongs to the pope, by allowing ordinaries to confer them within a month.

23. Dissolves all begging orders established since the council of Lateran (1215), under Innocentius III., unless they have received the pope's approval.

26 and 27. Are directed against usury.

The last three relate to excommunication.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 937.

This council was never considered as œcumenical in the East.

M.

Macon, 581. MACON. [*Concilium Matisconense.*] Held in 584, by order of king Gontram; the archbishops of Lyons, Vienne, Sens, Bourges, Besançon, and Tarantaise were present, together with fifteen other French bishops; Priscus of Lyons presiding. Nineteen canons were published.

The first three relate to the intercourse of the clergy with women, nuns, &c.

4. Excommunicates those who kept back legacies left to the Church.

5. Forbids the clergy to dress like laymen, and sentences to thirty days' imprisonment, with no food but bread and water, those who dressed immodestly, and who carried arms.

7. Forbids a judge to imprison a clerk without the bishop's permission, except in a criminal case.

8. Forbids the clergy to carry their suits, &c., before lay judges.

9. Directs the clergy to fast three times a week from the feast of S. Martin to that of Christmas, and upon these fast-days they were to read the canons.

10. Orders the clergy to obey their bishops, and to celebrate the festivals with them.

13. Forbids Jews to act as judges amongst Christians.

14. Forbids the Jews to appear in the streets from Maundy Thursday until Easter Monday.

17. Deprives false witnesses of communion until death.

19. Relates to the case of a nun named Agnes, who having escaped from her convent, endeavoured to persuade some persons of influence, by the offer of a large part of her property, to let her return into the world: she herself and all who should offer or accept such bribes, are declared excommunicate.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 966.

MACON. Held by order of king Gontram, or Guntheram, October 23, 585. Priscus, archbishop of Lyons, presided, and forty-three bishops and the deputies of twenty others, absent, besides three bishops who were without sees, attended. Faustianus, whom Gundobald, the enemy of Gontram, had made bishop of Aix, was deposed, and Nicetius put into his place; also Ursicinus who had harboured Gundobald, was suspended from the exercise of his ministerial functions[1]. Twenty canons were published. Macon, 585.

1. Enacts penalties suited to the different ranks of

[1] He was first excommunicated, but upon confession of his fault, he was put to three years penance, during which time he was forbidden to shave his beard, cut his hair, eat meat, or drink wine.

Macon, 585. life, for infringing the holiness of the Lord's-day: thus, it decrees that an advocate shall be driven from the bar, a peasant shall be flogged, a clerk or monk shall be deprived of the society of his brethren, and excommunicated for six months [2].

2. Orders the due observation of Easter, and forbids all servile work to be done at that season for six days.

3. Forbids to baptize infants except at Easter, unless in cases of sickness: one reason given for this is, that they may be admitted to the honour of the priesthood in after years, if they shall prove worthy; from which it appears, that to have received holy baptism at any other time than at Easter was a bar to admission to holy orders.

4. Orders all persons, both men and women, to offer bread and wine at the holy altar every Sunday, in order to do away with their sins, and to give them a share in the merits of Abel and all other righteous offerers.

6. Orders the priest to celebrate the communion fasting, and that what remains of the eucharist, dipped in wine, shall be given to the children on Wednesday and Friday after mass.

8. Forbids to remove by force those who have fled for sanctuary into churches.

9 and 10. Relate to actions at law in which the clergy are concerned, and forbids the civil courts to take cognizance of them.

13. Forbids bishops to keep sporting dogs and hawks.

15. Treats of the respect which the laity ought to show towards the clergy, and enjoins, that if a layman on horseback shall meet a clergyman on foot, he shall immediately get off his horse to salute him [3].

[2] "Keep ye the Lord's day, which gave to us a second birth, and freed us from all sin. Let no one engage in law pleas, or put the yoke upon his beasts; but let all spend their time in hymns and in praising God, intent both in body and mind; let those who are near the church hasten there; let your hands and eyes be all the Lord's during the whole day," &c.

[3] "Statuimus ut si quis sæcularium quempiam clericorum in itinere obviam habuerit, usque ad inferiorem gradum honoris veneranter (sicut condecet Christianum) illi colla subdat, per cujus officia et obsequia fidelissima Christianitatis jura promeruit. Et si quidem ille sæcularis equo vehitur, clericusque similiter sæcularis galerum de capite auferat, et clerico sinceræ salutationis munus adhibeat. Si vero clericus pedes graditur et sæcularis vehitur equo sublimis, illico ad terram defluat et debitum honorem prædicto clerico sinceræ caritatis exhibeat."

19. Forbids the clergy, upon pain of being deposed, to be present at the examination of persons accused of capital crimes, or at their execution.

20. Directs that a national synod shall be held every three years, to be convoked by the bishop of Lyons, or by the king.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 979. *Greg. Turon. Hist. France*, l. 8. c. 7.

MADRID. [*Concilium Madritense.*] Held in January, 1473, by cardinal Roderick, the pope's legate, with several prelates. The object of the council was to remedy the ignorance and disorderly conduct of the clergy of Spain, of whom scarcely any understood Latin, and the greater part were wholly given up to riotous living and debauchery.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1465. *Aguirre*, T. 3. Madrid, 1473.

MAGFIELD. [*Concilium Maghfeldense.*] Held in 1362, by Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, in which a list of festivals to be observed strictly was drawn up, and the celebration of Sunday ruled to begin on Saturday night at vespers. Magfield, 1362.

The following are the feasts specified, on which all people in the province of Canterbury are charged to abstain from every kind of work :—

All Sundays.

The feasts of the Nativity, S. Stephen, S. John, Innocents, S. Thomas the Martyr, Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, S. Matthias, Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Easter and three following days, S. Mark, SS. Philip and Jacob, Invention of the Cross, the Ascension, Pentecost and three following days, Corpus Christi, Nativity of S. John the Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, Translation of S. Thomas, S. James, Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, S. Lawrence, S. Bartholomew, Nativity of S. Mary, Exaltation of the Holy Cross, S. Matthew, S. Michael, S. Luke, SS. Simon and Jude, All Saints, S. Andrew, S. Nicholas, Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, S. Thomas; as well as the feast of the dedication of each church, and of the saints to whom the parish church is dedicated, and other feasts enjoined by the ordinary.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1933. *Johnson, Ecc. Canon. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 560.

MALINES. [*Concilium Mechliniense.*] Held in 1570, in June, Martin Rithovius, bishop of Ypres, presiding, in the absence of the archbishop of Malines. Malines, 1570.

The decrees of Trent were received, and all the bishops of the province ordered not to allow any profession of faith differing from the one laid down in that council; the bishops were also ordered to visit all churches in their dioceses, even those which were exempt. The following subjects were also discussed, and regulations relating to them drawn up: — Baptism, orders, the celebration of festivals, the duty of bishops' residence, the life and conversation of the clergy, seminaries and schools[4], catechism, monks, and nuns. The regulations upon all these matters are contained in nine chapters.— Tom. xv. Conc. p. 789.

Malines, 1607. MALINES. Held in 1607, by Matthias, archbishop of Malines, who presided at the head of six bishops, his suffragans; several regulations were drawn up under twenty-six heads.

The second and eight following relate to the seven sacraments and to indulgences.

11. Directs that care be taken that there shall be preaching and catechizing every Sunday and holiday.

12. Relates to the proper celebration of divine service.

13. Relates to fast-days and festivals.

14. Relates to relics and images; proscribes those of the latter which have not been approved by the ordinary, or which are immodest, obscene, or worldly.

15. Forbids any person to exorcise without the permission of the bishop.

24. Relates to monks and nuns, and orders that no more persons be received into a monastery than the revenue, or the usual alms, will support; orders an extraordinary confessor for nuns three or four times a year.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1534.

Mans, 1188. MANS. [*Concilium Cenomanense.*] Held in 1188, by the king of England, Henry II.; many bishops and nobles from the provinces under the rule of England attended, and a tenth of all their revenues and goods was granted towards the expenses of the holy war.— Tom. x. Conc. p. 1760.

Mantua 1067. MANTUA. [*Concilium Mantuanum.*] Held in

[4] This synod provided for the institution of Sunday schools, for the instruction of those who were hindered by their worldly calling from attending during the week. It allowed them to be held in churches, when no other fit place could be found.

1067. In this council Alexander II. cleared himself by an oath of the charge of simony brought against him, and sufficiently proved the validity of his election, whereupon the bishops of Lombardy, who had opposed him, yielded. The antipope, Cadatous, on the contrary, who had taken the style of Honorius II., was condemned, unanimously, as simoniacal.—*Sigebert*, A. D. 1067. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1179. (or 1064, *Labbe*).

MARSIAC. [*Concilium Marsiacense.*] Held December 8th, 1326, by William de Flavacour, archbishop of Auch, and his suffragans; they published fifty-six canons, amongst which are the following:— Marsiac, in Auch, 1326.

2 and 3. Forbid to receive the clergy of another diocese without letters from their own bishop; excommunicate those who permit such clerks to administer the holy sacrament.

4, 5, and 6. Relate to the offices of archdeacon, legate, and ordinary.

8. To the immunities of the church and clerks.

18. Renews the old canon upon the subject of the life proper to be led by clerks, monks, and lay-persons.

19. Directs all clerks in holy orders and monks to be present at the saying of the seven canonical hours. Orders the same service as usual to be performed daily during an interdict, but in a low voice, with the doors closed and without any sound of the bells.

20. Forbids clerks to walk at night after the bell or trumpet has been sounded without a light, to avoid scandal.

21, 22, and 23. Forbid clerks and monks to endeavour to persuade persons to choose their burial-places with them. Forbid lay-persons to be buried within the church without leave of the bishop and rector. Recommend moderation in funeral pomp; and forbid all loud cries and lamentations which interrupt the service.

34. Orders bishops to provide for the subsistence of poor rectors.

36. Declares that the curates of parishes in the gift of the regulars, shall not be removed without sufficient cause, and by the same bishops who have instituted them; that monks, being incumbents of livings, shall submit in all things to the bishop, notwithstanding any privilege to which they may lay claim.

38 and 39. Relate to archidiaconal visitations, and restrain the great expense to which the clergy were put on these occasions. Forbids the archdeacons to take

with them, when visiting, more than five horses and five footmen, or any dogs or birds for sport.

40. Orders that a church or churchyard in any way polluted shall be purified by the bishop with holy water.

41. Provides for the celebration of the feasts of saints, and for the due veneration of relics.

42. Establishes the feast of S. Martha, the sister of S. Mary Magdalene, on the fourth of the calends of August.

57. Of interdicts.

58. Forbids to lay a place under interdict on account of pecuniary debt.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1747.

Mayence, 813. MAYENCE. [*Concilium Moguntinum.*] Held June 9th, 813, by order of Charlemagne; composed of thirty bishops and twenty-five abbots; Hildebald, archbishop of Cologne and arch-chaplain, presided. The object of the council was to restore the discipline of the Church; to this end the gospels, the canons of the Church, and certain of the works of the fathers were read, amongst others the pastoral of S. Gregory. The abbots and monks also read the letter of S. Benedict. Fifty-six canons were published, the three first treat of faith, hope and charity.

2. Orders the administration of holy baptism after the Roman use, and restricts it to Easter and Pentecost, except in cases of necessity.

6. Orders bishops to take care of disinherited orphans.

9. Orders canons to eat in common, and to sleep in the same dormitory.

11. Relates to the life of the monks.

13. To that of nuns.

22. Is directed against vagabond clerks,

23. Gives entire liberty to clerks and monks who have been forced to receive the tonsure.

28. Orders all priests at all times to wear the stole to mark their sacerdotal character.

32. Defines the difference between the *exomologesis* and *litania;* the former it states to be solely for confession of sin, the latter to implore help and mercy.

33. Orders the observance of the great Litany by all Christians, barefooted with ashes.

35. Confirms nineteen canons of Gangra on fasting.

36 and 37. Relate to holydays and Sundays.

43. Forbids mass to be said by a priest alone; for how can he say *Dominus vobiscum*, and other like things, when no one is present but himself?

47. Orders godparents to instruct their godchildren.

52. Forbids all interments within the church except in the case of bishops, abbots, priests, or lay-persons distinguished for holiness of life.

54. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree.

55. Forbids parents to stand as sponsors for their own children, and forbids marriages between sponsors and their godchildren, and the parents of their godchildren.

56. Declares that he who has married two sisters, and the woman who has married two brothers, or a father and son, shall be separated, and never be permitted to marry again.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1239.

MAYENCE. Held about the 1st of October, 847, by order of Louis of Germany, under Rabanus, archbishop of Mayence, assisted by twelve bishops, his suffragans, and several abbots, monks, priests, and others of the clergy, including the chorepiscopi. Thirty-one canons were published. Mayence, 847.

2. Warns bishops to be assiduous in preaching the word of God.

7. Leaves the disposition of church property to the bishops, and asserts their power over the laity.

11. Forbids to endow new oratories with the tithes or other property belonging to churches anciently founded, without the bishop's consent.

13. Relates to the life to be observed by clerks and monks. Forbids joking, gaming, unsuitable ornaments, delicate living, excess in eating or drinking, unjust weights or measures, unlawful trades, &c.

14. Orders all monks holding livings to attend the synods and give an account of themselves.

15. Forbids the clergy to wear long hair, under pain of anathema.

30. Forbids marriage within the fourth degree.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 39.

MAYENCE. Held in 848, in October, under the same Rabanus. A monk, named Gothescalcus, presented a paper upon predestination, in which he asserted that as the Almighty had, before the creation of the world, irrevocably predestinated all the elect to eternal life, of His own free grace, so had He also predestinated Mayence, 848.

the wicked to eternal damnation He reprimanded Rabanus for saying that the wicked are not by any means predestinated to eternal death, but that it is only *foreseen* in their case. The doctrine of Gothescalcus was condemned, and he himself remitted to Hincmar of Rheims for judgment. Rabanus recommended that he should be imprisoned.—*Baronius*, A.D. 848, Tom. viii. Conc. p. 52.

Mayence, 888. MAYENCE. Held in 888; three princes, the archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, Treves, and Rheims, and nineteen bishops (amongst whom was Thiadmar of Salisbury) were present. In the preface the bishops attribute the public calamities to private sins and to the interruption of provincial councils, and they drew a wretched picture of the state of the Church; twenty-six canons were published, taken for the most part from those of the preceding council.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 401.

Mayence, 1028. MAYENCE. [properly *Concilium Geizletense.*] Held at Geizlete, a place near to Mayence, in 1028, in which a man of gentle blood accused of the murder of the count Sigefroi, cleared himself by undergoing the ordeal of hot iron, from which, in the judgment of the council, he escaped unscathed.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 860. *Mansi, Supp.* tom. i. coll. 1241.

Mayence, 1049. MAYENCE. Held in 1049; the emperor, Henry the Black, was present, and about forty bishops. Statutes were drawn up against simony, the marriage of priests, and other abuses.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1046.

Mayence, 1071. MAYENCE. Held on the 15th of August, 1071, upon the affair of Charles, canon of Magdeburg, who succeeded to the bishopric of Constance, upon the death of Rumoldus, and whom the clergy of Constance refused to receive, upon the plea that he had been guilty of simony and sacrilege. Charles, after some discussion, gave back the ring and pastoral staff into the hands of the king, saying that, in accordance with the decrees of pope Celestine, he would not be the bishop of those who were unwilling to receive him.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1204.

Mayence, 1075. MAYENCE. Held in 1075, by Sigefroi, archbishop of Mayence, assisted by the bishop of Coire, legate of the holy see. Here the decree of the council of Rome of the preceding year was published, which enjoined the archbishop, under pain of deposition, to oblige the prelates and other clergy of his province to give up either

their wives or the service of the altar. The clergy present, however, were so enraged against him, that fearing for his life, the archbishop gave up the attempt, and left the execution of the decree to the pope.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 345.

MAYENCE. Held in 1225, by Cardinal Conrad, legate of Honorius III. It is by some called a synod of Germany. Fourteen canons were published, which relate to the incontinence of the clergy, and simony. Mayence, 1225.

6. Declares that excommunicated priests who dare to perform any clerical function whilst under excommunication shall be deposed both from their office and benefices without hope of being ever restored, shall be treated as infamous, deprived of the power of leaving their property by will, and never again permitted to hold any kind of ecclesiastical benefice.

In this council Frederic, count of Isemburg, was excommunicated for the murder of S. Engelbert, archbishop of Cologne, whose corpse was brought into the assembly—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 294.

MAYENCE. Held in 1233, against the heretics called Stadinges, from the city of Stade in Germany; these men were a sect of Manichæans, and practised the most horrible impurities. Doctor Conrad of Marbourg, who had given crosses to those who were willing to arm against them, and who it seems had caused "innumerable heretics" to be burned, was murdered on his way from the council. Mayence, 1233.

This gave rise to another council at Mayence in the same year, in which those who had been suspected of heresy were absolved, and the murderers of Conrad sent to the pope to obtain absolution.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 478.

MAYENCE. Held in 1261, by the archbishop of Mayence, in obedience to the pope's order to take measures for opposing the Tartars. Several regulations were published for the augmentation of Divine service and the reformation of the clergy.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 816. Mayence, 1261.

MAYENCE. Held in 1310, by Peter, archbishop of Mayence. In this council an abridgement of the canons of the preceding councils was drawn up, and the affair of the Templars, by the pope's direction, discussed. Count Hugo, with twenty other Templars, suddenly rushed into the council during their deliberation, Mayence, 1310.

and solemnly and earnestly protested against the cruel persecution set on foot against their order. He utterly denied the truth of the horrible charges brought against them; reminded the bishops present that numbers of the Templars had died at the stake protesting their innocence, and finally he appealed to a future pope.

The archbishop, for the sake of peace, admitted his appeal, and promised to forward it to Rome, and to do his best that they should be left in peace and quietness.

During the course of this year several councils or assemblies were held upon the same subject in different places, and great numbers of the Templars were burnt to death, *e. g.* fifty-nine at Paris, and nine at Senlis, not one of whom confessed the crimes imputed to them. At the council of Ravenna in 1311 they fared better.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1536.

Mayence, 1549.

MAYENCE. Held in 1549 by Sebastian Heusenstein, archbishop of Mayence, with the deputies of the bishops of his province and the principal of his clergy. Forty-seven canons were published concerning the faith, and fifty-seven canons of discipline. Amongst the first we find an exposition of the mystery of the Sacred Trinity, according to the faith of the Church; it is further stated that man was created with righteousness, and endued with grace, but that he was possessed of free-will; afterwards the fall of man and his justification are spoken of, and it is declared that this justification proceeds from the grace of God; that it is given before any merit; that this justification is given when man receives the Holy Spirit, with faith, hope, and charity, which gifts it declares to be inherent in him, and not merely imputed, so that man is not only accounted righteous, but is so in reality, yet not through his own merits, but by God's grace and righteousness communicated to him; that the charity which justifies must be accompanied by good works, of which *grace* is the source and principle. (Canons 7 and 8.)

The council, moreover, in the canons of faith set forth the doctrine of the sacraments, and decided, against the heretics, that they are not bare ceremonies, but effectual signs of grace, which they are, by divine operation, the means of conveying to those who receive them worthily.

With regard to ceremonies, it is decreed that such ought to be retained as incite the people to meditate

upon God; amongst these are reckoned the sacraments, churches, altars, images, holy vestments, banners, &c. As to images, the council decrees that the people should be taught that they are not set up to be worshipped, and that none ought to be set up in churches which are likely to inspire worldly and carnal thoughts, rather than piety. Curates are also enjoined to remove the image of any saint to which the people flocked, as if attributing some sort of divinity to the image itself, or as supposing that God or the saints would perform what they prayed for by means of that particular image, and not otherwise. Afterwards the following matters are treated of: devout pilgrimages, worship of saints, prayer for the dead, and the law of fasting.

Amongst the fifty-six canons of discipline and morality, we find it ruled (by canon 61), that when the lesser festivals fall on a Sunday, they shall be kept on some day following or preceding; that apostate monks upon their return to their duty shall be kindly treated; that nuns shall not leave their convent without the bishop's permission; that preaching shall not be allowed, nor the holy sacraments administered, in chapels attached to private houses; that care shall be taken that all school-masters be sound Catholics, &c.

Finally, it is declared that the council received the acts of the holy œcumenical councils, and yielded entire submission to the catholic, apostolic, Roman Church in all things.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 667.

MEAUX. [*Concilium Meldense.*] Held June 17, 845. Venilon, archbishop of Sens, Hincmar of Rheims, and Rodolph of Bourges, were present with their suffragans. They made a selection from the canons made in the councils of Coulaines (Colonia), Theonville, Lorris (A. D. 843), and Beauvais, to which they added sixty-six others. Meaux, 845

1 and 2. Declare that the residences of bishops ought to be holy houses, and that worldly persons and women ought not to be introduced there. This law was directed against a practice of the kings and great men of those times, who in the course of their journeyings stopped at the bishops' houses and brought all sorts of persons into them.

9. Suspends bishops who without just cause absent themselves from a council.

12. Recommends residence, and that the clergy should avoid female society.

16. Relates to the dilapidated state of the religious houses founded by the Scotch for those of their people who came over to France; declares that not only strangers could not be admitted, but that even the religious residing in them had been turned out, and compelled to go from door to door begging, owing to the funds having been alienated.

20. Forbids the chorepiscopi to administer confirmation, consecrate churches, or confer orders, which it states to be functions peculiar to the episcopate.

22 and 23. Direct that when a bishop is ill or unable to discharge his duty, he shall write to the metropolitan for instructions how to act.

24. Forbids the clergy to baptize out of the church, if there be a font, and at any other than the appointed seasons.

26. Forbids to receive the clergy of another diocese without letters.

The king's consent to these regulations appears not to have been given.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1813.

Melfi, 1089. MELFI. [*Concilium Melfitanum.*] Held in 1089 by pope Urban II. assisted by seventy bishops and twelve abbots. Duke Roger did homage to the pope, and sixteen canons were published.

1. Is directed against simony.

2. Enjoins continence upon all clerks from the period of their being received into the order of subdeacons.

3. Excludes from holy orders persons who previous to their subdeaconate have been twice married, and all persons not of approved chastity.

4. Forbids to ordain a sub-deacon under fourteen, a deacon under twenty-four, and a priest under thirty years of age.

8. Forbids lay investitures.

11. Forbids to confer holy orders upon slaves.

13. Condemns a luxurious way of living amongst the clergy.

15. Forbids to receive those who have been excommunicated by their bishop.

16. Of false penance.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 476.

Melun, 1216. MELUN. [*Concilium Melodunense.*] Pope Innocent III. having written to the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans to inform them of the sentence of excommu-

nication passed against king Philip Augustus, on account of the aid he had given to his son Louis in his attempt to take the crown of England from king John, the great men of the kingdom assembled in council (1216), and protested that they should not regard the king as excommunicated until they were better assured of the pope's will upon the subject. As for Louis and all his followers, they were solemnly excommunicated by the pope in the month of June in this year.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 240.

MERIDA. [*Concilium Emeritense.*] Held November 6, 666, in the reign of king Receswinthus. Twelve bishops were present, Proficius, the metropolitan of Merida, presiding. Twenty-three canons were published. Merida, 666.

3. Directs that mass be said and prayers offered daily for the king and his army in time of war.

5. Forbids a bishop, hindered by lawful business from attending a synod, to send a simple deacon as his deputy; directs that he shall send a priest, who shall sit behind the bishops.

6. Charges all bishops to obey their metropolitan when summoned to celebrate the festivals of Easter and Christmas with him.

7. Orders the holding of annual councils, suspends for a year bishops who refuse to attend without good cause.

8. Relates to differences about the extent of dioceses, and directs that thirty years' possession be considered as giving right.

9. Forbids all compulsory fees for the holy chrism and baptism.

13. Orders that all offerings made in churches be divided into three parts, one for the bishop, another for priests and deacons, and the third for the inferior clerks.

16. Directs that a third part of the revenue of each church be spent in repairs.

17. Enacts various penalties against persons speaking evil of deceased bishops.

18. Orders priests who by the bishop's permission hold two or more poor parishes together, to maintain at their own expence clerks to say for them the holy office every Sunday.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 497.

MERTON. [*Concilium Mertonense.*] Held at Merton, in Surrey, 1305, by Robert de Winchelsey, archbishop of Canterbury. Six constitutions were published. Merton, 1305.

Merton, 1305.

1. Relates to tithes, orders an uniform demand of tithe throughout the province, unless the parishioners redeem them at a competent rate. This constitution orders that tithe be paid of the profits or wages of handicraftsmen and merchants, masons, victuallers, &c.; and that in demanding a mortuary (or principal legacy), the custom of the province, with the possession of the Church, be observed. Rectors, vicars, &c., who *either for fear or favour of men*, do not demand their tithes *effectually*, as aforesaid, to be punished.

2. Relates to certain difficulties in taking tithe or sheep removed from parish to parish, and other similar matters.

3. Ordains that if a man, at his death, have three or more animals among his chattels, the second best shall be reserved for the church where he received the sacraments when alive.

4. Declares what things the parishioners are bound to provide for the service and repairs of their church, viz. a legend[5], an antiphonar[6], a graduale[7], a psalter, a troper[8], an ordinal[9], a missal, a manual[1], a chalice, the principal vestment[2], with a chesible[3], dalmatic[4], tunicle[5], a choral cope with all its appendages[6], a fontal for the high altar, three towels, three surplices, one rochet[7], a cross for processions, a cross for the

[5] "Legend," or "Lectionary," contained the lessons to be read throughout the year.

[6] "Antiphonar," containing all that was appointed to be sung or said at the seven hours, except the lessons. Johnson estimates the cost of one of these books at about 40*l.* of our money (thirteen marks). The common price of a mass book was five marks, equal to a curate's stipend.

[7] "Graduale," "Gradual," containing all that was appointed to be sung by the choir at high mass.

[8] "Troper," contained the sequences only, which were not inserted in every Graduale.

[9] "Ordinal," the book containing the manner of conducting the service.

[1] "Manual," containing the offices for baptism and the other sacraments, the form for blessing the holy water, &c.

[2] The "principal vestment" Johnson explains to be the best cope, used on festivals.

[3] "Chesible," a vestment used instead of the cope.

[4] "Dalmatic," the deacon's garment.

[5] "Tunicle," the sub-deacon's garment.

[6] Appendages of the cope, viz. alb, amice, stole, maniple, and girdle.

[7] "Rochet," a surplice without sleeves.

As one book only of each sort is ordered, Lyndwood infers

dead, a censer, a lanthorn, a hand-bell to carry before the host to the sick, a pyx for the body of Christ, a decent veil for Lent, banners for the rogations, bells with ropes, a bier, a vessel to hold the blessed water, an osculatory (or Pax), a candlestick for the wax-taper at Easter, a font with lock and key, the images in the church, the chief image in the chancel, the enclosure of the churchyard, the repairs of the body of the church, within and without, with the images, windows, books, and vestments. All things else to be done at the expense of the rector or curate. Merton, 1305.

5. Forbids stipendiary priests, *i. e.* such as had no share in the tithe of the parish, but were maintained by saying masses, &c., and others similarly maintained, to take any part of the fees, offerings, &c., without the incumbent's permission, under pain of excommunication; orders such priests to be present in the chancel, and not in the body of the church, or fields, at matins, vespers, and other offices, in surplices purchased at their own cost, and to join in the reading, singing, and psalmody. Forbids them on Sundays, festivals, and days of funerals, to begin their masses until the gospel at high mass is ended. Provides that they shall take an oath on the holy Books, not in any way to injure the churches or chapels, or their incumbents, &c., and especially to abstain from raising scandal and contention between rectors and parishioners. Forbids them to receive the confessions of the people belonging to the several parishes, &c., of the churches in which they minister, and to frequent taverns, stews, and bad houses.

6. Orders the clergy to enforce the payment of tithe as undermentioned, viz. of milk, and of the profits of woods, mast, trees, if sold, parks, fish in stews, rivers, or ponds, fruits, cattle, pigeons, seed, beasts in warren, fowling, gardens, court-yards, wool, flax, wine, grain, turfs, swans, capons, geese, ducks, eggs, hedge-rows, bees, honey, wax, lambs, calves, colts, and mills; also of what is caught in hunting, and profits of handicraftsmen and merchants. Orders that payment be enforced under pain of suspension, excommunication, and interdict. —*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1435—1438. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 278.

that where more were required, they were bought at the expence of the incumbent.

Metz, 590. METZ. [*Concilium Metense.*] Held in October, 590; in which Œgidius, archbishop of Rheims, was deposed and banished for high-treason against king Childebert. In this council the two rebellious nuns, Chrodielde and Basina, who had been excommunicated, are said to have been absolved; and Basina returned into her convent. Chrodielde, however, would not reform, and was again excommunicated in a council held at Poictiers in 593. See Note to C. Poictiers, 593.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1596.

Metz, 835. METZ. A council was held in the church of S. Stephen, in 835, in which Louis le Debonnaire, who had been unjustly excommunicated by Ebbo, archbishop of Rheims, was absolved. In the following year another council was held in the same church, in which the emperor Louis le Debonnaire was crowned by seven archbishops. Ebbo himself standing up in the pulpit, and proclaiming aloud the injustice of the former sentence of excommunication.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1694.

Metz, 859. METZ. Held in 859, to procure peace between Charles the Bald and Louis the German. Three archbishops and six bishops were deputed to Louis at Worms, to bear to him the conditions, contained in twelve chapters, upon which they consented to absolve him. The deputation failed of its end, as Louis declined to give any answer without first consulting the bishops of his kingdom.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 668.

Metz. 888. METZ. Held May 1, 888, by Ratbodus, archbishop of Treves, and three bishops, many priests being also present, in the church of S. Arnold. Thirteen canons were published.

2. Enjoins the payment of tithe to the priest who serves the church, and forbids patrons to retain any for themselves.

3. Enacts that no priest shall possess more than one church, except it be an ancient chapelry attached to the parish church.

6. Directs the priests to show to their bishops at the next synod the sacred books and vestments; orders them to keep the chrism sealed up; forbids clerks to dress like laymen; and relates, further, to god-parents.

7. Forbids Christians to eat and drink with Jews.

8. Forbids to say mass in unconsecrated places; orders that churches consecrated by chorepiscopi only be consecrated again by a bishop.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 412.

MEXICO. [*Concilium Mexicense.*] The first American council was held in 1524, by Ferdinand Cortez; Martin, the pope's legate, presiding over nineteen priests. It was decreed that Mexicans converted to the Catholic faith should separate from all their wives except one whom they shall choose, to whom they should be united in Christian wedlock. Mexico, 1524.

MEXICO. Held in 1585, by Peter Moya de Contrevas, archbishop of Mexico, assisted by six of his suffragans. A code of regulations, of great length, was drawn up, taken from the canons of Trent and of other councils, contained in five books.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1192—1378. Mexico, 1585.

MILAN. [*Concilium Mediolanense.*] After the Arian synod held at Antioch in 345, the bishops there assembled sent the new formulary of faith, the μακροστιχος, to the western bishops, assembled at Milan, by the hands of four of their order, viz. Demophilus, Macedonius, Eudoxius, and Martyrius. This new formulary the western bishops altogether rejected, declaring that they desired nothing beyond the Nicene Creed; and, on their part, required the oriental deputies to sign a condemnation of the Arian heresy; which the latter not only refused to do, but left the council in anger. This council was convoked by the emperor Constans, and met in 346.—*Sozom.* l. iii. c. xi. *Pagi, Note III. on Baronius*, A.D. 344. *Liberius Ep. ad Const.* Tom. ii. Conc. p. 614. Milan, 346.

MILAN. A numerous council, collected from the provinces of Milan and from Italy, was held in 347, to consider the means of putting into execution the decrees of the council of Sardica. What else passed is not certain, but it is supposed that Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, was called upon in this council to give account of his faith; he was condemned, and denounced as a heretic, for denying the Divinity of our Lord, and declaring that He was a mere man. Sentence of deposition was passed upon him, which for a long time could not be executed, owing to the great affection which his people had towards him. It is also believed that Ursaces and Valens, Arian bishops, in this council pretended, in a written document, to recant; and, according to S. Hilary, were re-united to the Church. See C. SARDICA, A.D. 347.—*Pagi, ad Baron.* A.D. 345, Note V. Tom. ii. Conc. p. 720. Milan, 347.

Milan, 355. pseudo-council.

MILAN. The Eusebians, as well as Liberius the pope, having demanded of the emperor Constantius the convocation of a council, it was assembled at Milan in the year 355. The object of the Eusebians was to effect the condemnation of S. Athanasius, and all the influence of the emperor was given to them. More than three hundred bishops from the West attended, but very few from the East[8]. The Eusebian bishops acted throughout with extreme violence, and a total disregard of all ecclesiastical usage. They, in the first place, brought forward an imperial edict containing all the venom of their heresy; upon this the papal legates demanded that the doctrine of Arius should be condemned, but Constantius declared this doctrine to be Catholic, and told them that he did not require their advice. S. Eusebius of Verceil having received the emperor's order to sign the condemnation of S. Athanasius, refused, but expressed his willingness to subscribe the Nicene Creed. All passed with great clamour and disturbance.

In the second session S. Eusebius of Verceil, Luciferus of Cagliari, Dionysius of Milan, and the two Roman legates were violently urged to sign the act of condemnation, but constantly refused.

The third session was held in the palace, the Arian party fearing the violence of the people, who had declared openly in favour of the Catholics. The emperor himself then sent for the three above-mentioned bishops, and commanded them either to sign the document, or to prepare for banishment; they, on their part, earnestly entreated him to remember the account he would be called upon to give in the day of judgment, and besought him not to introduce the heresy of Arius into the Church; but all was of no avail, and Eusebius, Dionysius[9], and Luciferus standing out without flinching

[8] This is supposed by some writers to be an error, and that the number was not so great. The synodal epistle was signed by thirty only.

[9] The fact is said to have been as follows. Dionysius, during the absence of Eusebius from the council, had been induced to sign the condemnation of Athanasius; but quickly repenting of his crime, he contrived with Eusebius, by the following trick, to erase his signature. When Eusebius was urged, with threats, to sign his name after that of Dionysius, he refused, upon the plea that being senior to Dionysius, both by age and by rank in the Church, it would ill become him to sign after the latter; where-

from the truth, were sentenced to be banished. After this Ursaces and Valens[1] excited the Arian eunuchs against Hilary the deacon, the pope's legate, whom they seized, stripped, and cruelly beat.

With regard to the other bishops, most of them succumbed and signed the condemnation of S. Athanasius, the most violent measures having been taken to compel them; many, however, after the council did all in their power to repair their crime, and some were exiled, or thrown into prison.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 771.

MILAN. Held in 390, S. Ambrose presiding. It is commonly supposed that in this council the sentence of the Gallic bishops against Ithacius Ursacius (who had caused the death of the Priscillianists by their fiery zeal against their errors) was confirmed by the bishops of Italy. Baronius (as well as the collection of councils) states that this same council condemned Jovinian, the author of a new heresy, which decried the merit of virginity. S. Jerome reduces his doctrine to the four following heads: 1. That virgins, widows, and married women, being baptized, have the same degree of merit, if there be no difference between them in other respects. 2. That they who have been regenerated in baptism cannot be overcome by the devil. 3. That there is no difference, in point of merit, between those who abstain from meat and those who partake of it with thanksgiving. 4. That all those who have kept their baptismal state shall have the same glory in heaven. From these principles other errors were deduced, viz. that there is no difference of degree in sin, that fasting is not requisite, that there will be no distinction of merits in heaven. The fathers of the council condemned the opinions of Jovinian and his followers, and they were driven out of the city—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1040. S. Jerome. Milan, 390.

MILAN. Held in 451, convoked by Eusebius, bishop of Milan, at the request of S. Leo the Great. All the suffragans of Milan were present, in all twenty bishops, amongst whom were Crispinus of Pavia, Maximus of Turin, Abundius of Como, Optatianus of Brescia. The letter of the pope to Eusebius was read; Milan, 451.

upon the Arian party, caught by the hope of getting the name of such a man, eagerly erased the name of Dionysius; after which, Eusebius refused constantly to sign.

[1] See the preceding council.

the legates then made a report of what was passing in the East, and especially of the miseries arising from the acts of the Latrocinium at Ephesus; afterwards the celebrated letter of S. Leo to Flavianus was read, and the council unanimously declared that it contained the true doctrine of the Catholic Church upon the subject of the Incarnation, and that it was built upon the teaching of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. At the same time, they decreed that all who should oppose this doctrine should be anathematized. Finally, a synodal letter was addressed to the pope, filled with expressions of esteem and respect.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1486.

Milan, 1287. MILAN. Held September 12th, 1287, by Otto, the archbishop, assisted by eight of his suffragans and the deputies of all the chapters of the province; ten canons were published, in which they ordered the observation of the papal constitutions and the laws of the emperor, Frederic II., against heretics. Abbots and Abbesses, monks and nuns, were ordered to observe the rule of S. Benedict, or that of S. Augustine, and monks were forbidden to enter nunneries. The power of building churches and oratories was declared to be solely in the hands of the bishop.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1333. *Muratori, Rer. Ital.* t. iv.

Milan, 1291. MILAN. Held November 27th, 1291, by archbishop Otto Visconti, with his suffragans, to take measures for the recovery of the Holy Land, which had been lost by the capture of Acre, May 18th, in this year. Twenty-nine canons relating to the crusades to the East were published.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1361. *Muratori*, vol. viii. [Milan, 1726.]

Milan, 1565. MILAN. The first of the provincial councils of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held in September, 1565. It was composed of cardinal Guy Ferraro, the bishops of Alba, Vigevano, Tortona, Casal, Cremona, and others. Borromeo, who presided, although very young at the time, directed all the decrees, and encouraged the older bishops to observe them, and to watch over their flocks and their churches.

In the first session, Borromeo made a Latin speech upon the need of provincial councils. The decrees of Trent were confirmed, and the execution of them recommended. Several statutes and ordinances concerning ecclesiastical discipline and the reform of the

Church were drawn up, amongst which all that concerns the life and conduct of bishops is especially laid down. The constitutions of the council are divided into three parts. In the first, comprising twelve chapters, are contained excellent rules for the preaching of God's word; others treat of the worship due to images, and of the proper method of keeping the festivals; others forbid any sort of scenic representation of our Lord's passion, whether in church or elsewhere. In the second part are contained sixty-eight articles upon the sacraments, the life of bishops and clerks, &c., and matters relating to ecclesiastical duties. The third relates to places of charity and piety, such as hospitals, monasteries, and the duties of nuns, &c.; forbids all intercourse with Jews. Penalties were enacted against those who should violate these constitutions. The three last contain fifteen chapters.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 242.

MILAN. The second provincial council of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held April 24th, 1569. Three chapters were published. Milan, 1569.

1. Contains twenty-nine decrees upon various subjects, viz. the administration of the sacraments, the duty of bishops to cause a good Catechism to be printed for the use of children, the qualifications of godparents, the denial of Christian burial to public usurers, &c.; the prohibition of Pius V. to physicians to visit a patient more than three times who will not confess was removed.

2. Contains thirty-six decrees concerning the mass and the holy offices. Amongst other things ruled, it is decreed, that clerks may not pass from one diocese to another without the bishop's leave; that churches may not be ornamented with tapestry and indecent pictures; that old and worn-out copies of the Sacred Scriptures in churches be burned, and not put to any profane use; orders bishops to take care that lay persons do not build their houses against the walls of the church; that the bishop shall visit his seminary every three months.

3. Contains twenty-two regulations concerning the temporalities of the Church and her rights; it is declared that a bishop ought not to accept indifferently all resignations; that he ought to hinder the appropriation to any other purpose of funds intended for the fabric of the church.

Three decrees relate to nuns; two direct the bishop to forbid, under anathema, to take or receive any sum on account of taking the veil, and that the bishop shall prescribe after the woman has taken the veil what sum shall be paid for her maintenance.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 337.

Milan, 1573. MILAN. The third provincial council of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held April 24th, 1573; twenty canons were published relating to the proper observation of festivals, the establishment and visiting of schools, the administration of the sacraments, the celebration of the holy office, the duties of curates, canons, monks, &c.

Canon 15. Strictly forbids women to enter the church without a veil.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 365, &c.

Milan, 1576. MILAN. The fourth provincial council of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held May 10th, 1576. Eleven bishops were present with the apostolic visiter general. The acts of the council are divided into three parts:—

Part 1. Relates to the faith and points of doctrine, and contains twenty-six canons, of which:—

2. Treats at length of relicks, the bodies of saints, miracles, and images.

11. Treats of churches, forbids any window so built that a person outside may be able to see the celebration of the holy mysteries. Orders the holy water stoop to be *within* the church on the right hand.

13. Of sepulchres; forbids them in churches without the bishop's permission, and on no account whatever in the choir.

14. Orders the erection of a cross in every churchyard.

15. Directs that there shall be at least two bells in every parish church.

17. Allows to teach children in church the rudiments of the Christian faith, but forbids all secular teaching.

24. Orders that the church bells be rung in time of storm and tempest, both to drive off the visitation, and that the people hearing them may come to church to pray, or at least may pray at home.

25. Of preaching the word of God.

Part 2. Treats of the administration of the sacraments, of pilgrimages, of processions, funerals, and distributions.

Part 3. Relates to bishops and other clergymen, their duties, studies, way of life, &c., &c., and contains fourteen canons.

In canon 1. Bishops are ordered always to dress in black on Fridays, and other minute distinctions are given concerning their life and conversation.

2. Relates to the life, &c., of clerks.

4. Of the provincial synod.

5. Of the diocesan synod.

10 and 11. Of regulars.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 408.

MILAN. The fifth provincial council of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held in 1579. The acts of this council are also divided into three parts. Milan, 1579.

Part 1. Contains eleven chapters, comprising instructions as to preaching, doctrine, vows, indulgences, &c., and treating of each sacrament singly.

Part 2. Containing thirty chapters, treats of the care due to the sick in time of the plague, of the duty of curates, magistrates, monks, and fathers of families under such circumstances to provide both spiritual and temporal assistance; treats also of the course to be adopted in monasteries attacked with this scourge. Nothing that could be done under such a visitation was omitted to be laid down by the archbishop, who had had ample experience in the matter.

Part 3. Contains twenty chapters. After speaking in detail of the sacraments, of orders and marriages, goes on to speak of seminaries, the duties of examiners, the life of the clergy, residence, the care of churches and their furniture, synods and visitations, and episcopal officers.

Fifteen bishops subscribed the acts of this council, and all the estates of the province were present.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 556.

MILAN. The sixth provincial council of Milan, under S. Charles Borromeo, was held in 1582, and was attended by nine bishops. In opening the council the archbishop exhorted the bishops present to lead an apostolic life. The decrees of the council are contained in thirty-one chapters. The most remarkable are those which condemn the readers of bad books, and all intercourse with heretics, and those relating to the conduct of Divine service, the sacraments, visiting the sick, processions, funerals, synods, the instructions to be given to soldiers, &c. One article condemns to excommuni- Milan, 1582.

cation nuns who shall admit any one, man or woman, within their walls to converse, unless with the bishop's permission [2].—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 706.

Milevi, 402. MILEVI. [*Concilium Milevitanum.*] Held August 27th, 402, Aurelius of Carthage presiding. The canons of Hippo and Carthage were confirmed, and five canons of discipline published, which are contained in the African code.

1. Confirms the ancient rule of the African Church, that the younger bishops shall give place to those of older standing, excepting the primates of Numidia and Mauritania, who always took precedence of all other primates of whatever standing.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1323.

Milevi, 416. MILEVI. Held in 416, towards the autumn. This was a provincial council of Numidia, and sixty-one bishops of the province attended. These bishops having learned the proceedings at the council of Carthage of the same year, wrote a synodal letter to pope Innocentius, in which, after enlarging upon the enormity of the heresy which denied the necessity of prayer in adults, and of baptism for children, and after showing how worthy it was of the notice and censure of the Church, they entreated him, since the salvation of Pelagius and Celestius could not be secured, that he would at least provide for that of others by condemning these heretics. Amongst the names attached to this letter are those of Silvanus, primate of the province (Numidia), Alypius, S. Augustine, Severus of Milevi, Fortunatus of Citha, and Possidius. S. Augustine also wrote to the pope another letter.

Innocentius, in reply to the letters of the fathers at Carthage and Milevi, praised the zeal and pastoral care of the African bishops, briefly established the true doctrine of grace, and condemned Pelagius and Celestius with their followers, declaring them to be separated from the Catholic Church. He also replied to the letters which S. Augustine and the four bishops, Aurelius, Alypius, Evodius, and Possidius, had addressed to him. These letters of Innocentius were written in a council held at Rome upon the subject in January, 417. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1537.

[2] It is impossible, in a work of this nature, to give any adequate analysis of the statutes published in these six synods of Milan, owing to their extent and minuteness of detail; but they are, in many respects, admirable.

Twenty-seven canons of discipline, found in the collections under the name of canons of Milevi, are attributed to this council.

MONTPELLIER. [*Concilium Montispessulani.*] Held in 1162, by pope Alexander III., assisted by ten bishops. Here the antipope, Victor (Octavianus), and his followers, were a second time excommunicated. At the same time the pope issued a bull withdrawing the monastery of Veselisse from the jurisdiction of that of Clugny, which had taken part against him.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1410. Montpellier, 1162.

MONTPELLIER. Held in December, 1195; Michael, the pope's legate, with many prelates of the province of Narbonne, attended. Several regulations were published; the observation of the "Trève de Dieu" ordered, indulgences granted to those who marched into Spain to fight against the infidels. Modesty in dress and frugality at table were recommended to the clergy, especially at that time, in order to appease the wrath of God. The bishops were left to use their own discretion as to employing interdicts to exterminate the heresy of the Albigenses.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1796. Montpellier, 1195.

MONTPELLIER. Held in January, 1215, by the legate, Peter of Beneventum; the archbishops of Narbonne, Auch, Embrun, Arles, and Aix, twenty-eight bishops, and several barons were present. Count Simon of Montford, who could not attend the council owing to the hatred which the people of the place had towards him, betook himself every day to a house of the Templars, just outside the town, and here the bishops consulted with him. The question before the council was the disposal of the city of Toulouse and the other places conquered by the Crusaders, and it was decided that they should be granted to Simon of Montfort, the pope consenting. Forty-six canons were published, relating partly to the immodest dress of some monks or secular clergy. Bishops were ordered to wear a long dress with the rochette whenever they walked abroad, and even at home when giving audience to strangers. The clergy were forbidden to dress in green or red, and the regular canons are directed always to wear the surplice over their dress. Canons and beneficed clergymen were forbidden to use bridles or leggings embroidered with gold. Montpellier, 1215 (or 1214, *Labbe*).

Canon 22, directs monks to give away what remains

from their table.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 183, and Append. p. 2330.

Montpellier, 1224. MONTPELLIER. Held in August, 1224, composed of all the bishops of the province, under the archbishop of Narbonne, to consider of the propositions of peace made by Raymond, count of Toulouse, and the Albigenses. Raymond promised to keep the Catholic faith, and to cause it to be held throughout his territories, to purge out from them all heretics, to restore the Church to her rights, to preserve her liberties, and to pay within three years fifteen thousand marks as an indemnification for what she had suffered, upon this condition, that the count of Montfort should relinquish his pretensions to the lands of the county of Toulouse; but Amauri, who pretended to be count of Toulouse, in virtue of a decree of Innocentius III. given in the council of Lateran, wrote to the bishops, and represented to them, that as he hoped to be able to bring the Albigenses into subjection, it would be a scandal to the whole Church should they enter into any agreement with Raymond.

The council appear to have acquiesced in his view of the matter, and the offer of Raymond was rejected.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 289, and Append. 2334.

Montpellier, 1258. MONTPELLIER. Held on September 6th, 1258, by James, archbishop of Narbonne. Eight statutes were published.

1. Excommunicates *ipso facto* all who usurp the property of the Church, and insult the persons of the clergy.

2. Forbids bishops to give the tonsure or holy orders to persons not of their own diocese.

3. Declares that clerks not living as clergymen ought, or carrying on any business, shall lose their privileges.

5. Forbids Jews to exact usury.

6. Forbids bishops to give letters to mendicant friars to authorize their begging before the friars have obtained leave of the metropolitan.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 778.

Mopsuestia, 550. MOPSUESTIA. [*Concilium Mopsuestanum.*] Held June 17, 550, by order of the emperor Justinian, on account of the troubles excited by the three chapters; nine bishops were present. Examination was made whether the name of Theodore of Mopsuestia was to be found in the

dyptychs of that church, and if not, whether it had been there within the memory of man. It appeared from the testimony of irreproachable witnesses far advanced in years, that his name either had never been inserted, or had been erased before their time. Notice of this was sent to the pope and the emperor—Tom. v. Conc. pp. 406 and 491.

MOSCOW. [*Concilium Moscoviense.*] The metropolitan Simon held a synod at Moscow about the year 1500. It was decreed that monasteries for men and for women should be separated; monks were forbidden to perform divine service, and widower clerks to consecrate the holy mysteries in the latter; unworthy clerks were sentenced to be degraded; all payments on account of ordination were forbidden.—*Mouravieff by Blackmore*, p. 92. Moscow, about 1500.

MOSCOW. Held in 1551, by the czar, John the Terrible; all the Russian bishops attended, and the metropolitan of Moscow; Macarius presided. The czar himself opened the synod by a speech, in which he exhorted the bishops to use all the understanding, knowledge, and ability each one possessed in their deliberations; promising that he would be ready to join and support them in correcting what was amiss, or in confirming what was well established, according as the Holy Spirit should direct them. He then put them in mind how in the year in which he was crowned he had charged all bishops and hegumens to collect the lives of the saints of their various dioceses or monasteries, and how that twenty new names had been in consequence glorified as saints in the church. Moscow, 1551.

The council then repeated and confirmed the decree, ordering that the memory of these saints should be celebrated in the Church.

After this the czar required of the council a reply to various questions relating to the external and internal discipline of the Church; whereupon they delivered a long answer, divided into one hundred chapters, which caused this assembly to be known ever after by the name of "the Council of the Hundred Chapters." These chapters appear not to have been signed by any Russian bishop, nor to have been submitted to the œcumenical patriarch for approval; and it is curious that Macarius himself, who presided at the council, makes no mention of it in his Books of the Genealogies,

in which he relates the history of affairs both in Church and state. These chapters give countenance to some superstitious customs and local errors, which in after years produced lamentable schisms.

In this council, moreover, the correction of the Church books, which was afterwards actually performed by the patriarch Nikon, was first proposed.—*Mouravieff, Blackmore's trans.* p. 103.

Moscow, 1655. MOSCOW. Held in the palace of the czar at Moscow in 1655, by the czar Alexis; Nikon, the patriarch of Moscow, presiding. The object of the council was the correction of the service-books, &c., of the Russian Church. Nikon, soon after his appointment to the patriarchate, had his attention drawn to the great alterations which had crept into the books then in use, which in many places, and even in the creed itself, differed from the ancient Greek and Sclavonic copies; he, therefore, induced the czar to convoke this council, at which the following metropolitans, Macarius of Novogorod, Cornelius of Cazan, Jonah of Rostoff, Silvester of the Steeps, and Michael of Servia were present, together with three archbishops and one bishop. The unanimous decision of the council was, that "the new books should be corrected by the old Sclavonic and Greek MSS., and that the primitive rule of the Church should be in all things adhered to."

This decision was confirmed in a council of Greek bishops, convened at Constantinople by the patriarch Paisius, whose judgment the Russian bishops had requested. Upon this the czar and the patriarch procured an immense number of MSS. and books from Mount Athos, by means of which and other assistance, the revision of the Russian service-books was completed.—*Mouravieff*, p. 204.

Moscow, about 1667. MOSCOW. Held in 1666 or 1667. Nikon, the patriarch, having by means of his enemies, fallen into disgrace with him who had formerly been his great friend and patron, the czar Alexis, had some years before in a moment of irritation abruptly renounced the patriarchate. This step had given rise to such disorders in the Church, that Alexis, in order to re-establish peace, was obliged to invite the eastern patriarchs to form a court for his trial. Two of whom, viz. Paisius of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch, accordingly arrived, and were received with great

honour. Besides the eastern patriarchs, there were present at this council four Russian metropolitans, viz. Pitirim of Novogorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, and Paul of the Steeps; six Greek metropolitans, viz. those of Nicea, Amasia, Iconium, Trebizond, Varna and Scio; the metropolitans of Georgia and Servia; six Russian and two other archbishops; and, lastly, five bishops, and fifty archimandrites, hegumens, and arch-priests, besides monks and others. Before this council Nikon was solemnly cited to appear, and having made every preparation as for death, he came in his character of patriarch, with his cross borne before him; finding no place prepared for him upon a level with the seats of the eastern patriarchs, he refused to sit, and remained standing. His accusation was read, with tears, by Alexis himself; it was to the effect, that he had, by his unlawful retirement and capricious conduct been the cause of grievous evils and disorders in the Church. A week was spent in deliberating upon his case, and in searching for precedents which had occurred in the Church of Constantinople. After which Nikon was summoned before the council; having heard his accusation read, sentence was passed upon him, to the effect that he should be degraded, retaining only the rank of a monk, and that he should pass the rest of his life in penance in a remote monastery. One voice only, that of an excellent bishop, Lazarus of Chernigoff, was raised in opposition to this cruel judgment. — *Mouravieff*, p. 227.

MOUSON. [*Concilium Mosomense.*] Held January 13, 948. Ruotbert, archbishop of Treves, his suffragans, and some other bishops, decreed that Artaud should keep possession of the see of Rheims; and that Hugo, who refused to appear at the council, as he had previously refused at Verdun, should be deprived of it, until he should appear before the general council (appointed to be held on the 1st August), and justify himself. See C. Verdun, 947.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 622. Mouson, 948.

MOUSON. Held June 2, 995. John XV., offended at the deposition of Arnulphus, and the election of Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II.) to the see of Rheims, sent Leo, abbot of S. Bonifacius, into France as his legate, who assembled this council. No other prelates, however, attended but the archbishop of Treves and the bishops of Verdun, Liege, and Munster, all of Mouson, 995.

them from Germany. The legate took his seat in the midst of them, and the archbishop Gerbert, being the party accused, was placed opposite to him. Gerbert defended himself with eloquence, and declared that he had been raised to the archbishopric without his own concurrence. The sentence of the council was, that he should abstain from the exercise of his archiepiscopal and sacerdotal functions until the matter should have been brought before the council of Rheims, convoked for the following July. This council, however, was not held so early, and whilst Hugo Capet lived, Gerbert remained archbishop, and Arnulphus a prisoner at Orleans. See C. Rheims, 991.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 747.

N.

Nantes, 660. NANTES. [*Concilium Nannetense.*] Held about the year 660, as Pagi has shown. (According to Labbe about 658.) S. Nivardus of Rheims presided. Twenty canons were published.

1. Directs parish priests to send away wanderers from neighbouring parishes who came to their churches on Sundays and holy days to the neglect of their own pastors; also directs them to drive out of the church those who refused to be reconciled with their enemies.

3. Forbids priests to live in the same house with any women whatever; also forbids women to go near the altar, or to wait upon the priests there, or to be seated within the chancel rails.

5. Forbids to give absolution to the sick, except upon condition that they promise to do suitable penance, in case of their recovery.

6. Forbids any fee for burials.

8. Forbids a priest to have charge of more than one church.

9. Orders that some of the bread offered for the holy eucharist be blessed, and given to the non-communicants.

10. Orders that all oblations and tithes be divided into four portions.

12. Permits divorce in case of adultery, but forbids the husband to marry again during the life of his wife so divorced on account of adultery. Orders seven years' penance for the sin of adultery.

19. Declares it to be offensive to the laws of God and man, for women to attend public meetings without necessity, and forbids nuns and widows to do so without their bishop's permission.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 486.

NANTES. Held about the year 1127, under the count Conon; Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, presiding. It was ruled that children by an incestuous marriage should have no share in the succession of their parents. That the children of priests should not receive holy orders except they should first have taken monastic vows. Anathema was pronounced against those who plundered shipwrecked property.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 918. Nantes, about 1127.

NANTES. Held in 1264; Vincent, archbishop of Tours, presiding. Nine canons were published. Nantes, 1264.

2. Forbids the number of monks in any priory or abbey to be diminished.

5. Forbids to set more than two dishes before the bishop in visitation, and orders that if more have been prepared they shall be given to the poor.

6. Forbids pluralities.

7. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to demand toll of the clergy.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 826.

NAPOLI (in PALESTINE). [*Concilium Neapolitanum.*] Held in 1120, at Napoli or Naplouse, supposed to be the ancient Samaria, convoked by the patriarch Guermondus and king Baldwin; about ten prelates and some lords attended. An exhortation was made to the people to reform their lives, in order to appease the anger of Heaven; also twenty-five canons were published, which are lost.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 884. *Guill. Tyrr.* Napoli, in Palestine, 1120.

NARBONNE. [*Concilium Narbonense.*] Held in 589; composed of eight bishops, from that part of Gaul which was in the hands of the Goths, whose king was Reccaredus; Migetius, archbishop of Narbonne, presided. The acts of the council of Toledo (589) were received; and fifteen canons were published. Narbonne, 589.

1. Forbids the clergy to wear purple.

2. Orders the Gloria Patri to be sung at the end of each psalm, and at the end of each division of those psalms which, on account of their length, were divided. [This was ordered as being a concise declaration of the true faith against the Arians.]

3. Suspends and excommunicates those of the clergy who loiter in public places chattering.

4. Inflicts a fine upon a freeman doing any servile work on Sunday, and if a slave, sentences him to receive one hundred lashes.

5. Forbids clerical conventicles or private meetings of the clergy.

9. Forbids Jews to sing psalms whilst carrying their dead to the grave.

12. Forbids the priest, except on account of illness, to leave the altar during mass.

14. Excommunicates those who keep conjurors in their houses, and commands to sell conjurors, after having publicly beaten them, and to give their price to the poor.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1027.

Narbonne, 791. NARBONNE. Held in 791[3], against the heresy of Felix of Urgel, who taught that our Lord was merely the *adopted* Son of God according to the *flesh*, but the *true* Son of God as to his *divinity*. This error was condemned subsequently in the councils of Ratisbon, Francfort, and Rome. Twenty-six bishops and the deputies of two others attended; but it does not appear that Felix, who was present, was condemned.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 964.

Narbonne, 1054. NARBONNE. Held August 25th, 1054; ten bishops, a large number of abbots, clerks, nobles, and laymen being present. The "Trève de Dieu" was confirmed, and twenty-nine canons published, in which temporal penalties were joined to spiritual.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1072.

Narbonne, 1227. NARBONNE. Held in Lent, 1227; Peter, archbishop of Narbonne presiding; twenty canons were published. The second, third, and fourth relate to excommunicated persons and to the Jews: the latter, in canon 3, are directed to carry upon the bosom the figure of a wheel to distinguish them; are forbidden to work on Sundays and festivals. Canon 4 orders them to pay yearly at Easter a certain sum for each family, as an offering to the parish church.

13, 14, 15, 16. Are directed against heretics, and charge the bishops to station in every parish spies to make enquiry into heresies and other notorious crimes, and to give in their report to them. Count Raymond, the count de Foix, the viscount Besiers, the people of

[3] The date assigned to this council in the Collection of Councils, is 788.

Toulouse, and all heretics and their abettors, were publicly excommunicated, and their persons and property given up to the attacks of the first aggressor.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 304.

NARBONNE. Held in 1235. The archbishops of Narbonne, Arles, and Aix, assisted by several other prelates, by the pope's command, drew up a grand rule concerning the penances, &c. which the preaching friars, (lately appointed inquisitors in those parts,) should impose upon heretics, i. e. upon those whom they had exempted from prison on account of their having surrendered themselves within the specified time of grace, and given information against themselves and others. They were directed to come to church every Sunday, bearing the cross, and to present themselves to the curate between the singing of the epistle and gospel, holding in their hands the rod with which to receive discipline; to do the same at all processions; to be present every Sunday at mass, vespers, and sermons; to carry arms at their own expense in defence of the faith and of the Church against the Saracens, &c. Those heretics who had not so surrendered themselves, or who in any other way had rendered themselves unworthy of indulgence, but who nevertheless submitted to the Church, were ordered to be imprisoned for life; but as their number was so great that it was impossible to build sufficient prisons to contain them, the preaching friars were permitted to defer their imprisonment until they had received the pope's instructions. As for those who refused obedience, who would neither enter the prison nor remain there, they were abandoned to the secular arm without further hearing, as were also the relapsed. The rest of these twenty-nine canons are conceived in the same cruel spirit,—a spirit very contrary to that of the Church and of the early councils, and equally wanting in wisdom, mildness, and charity. —*Fleury*. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 487. Narbonne, 1235.

NARBONNE. Held April 15th, 1374; Peter, archbishop of Narbonne, presiding. Twenty-eight canons were published. The first four relate to the holding of provincial councils; the fifth directs that they who take upon themselves to preach, &c., without mission shall be seized. Narbonne, 1374.

16. Enacts penalties against those who do not inform against blasphemers of God, the Virgin, and the saints.

26. Forbids burial to the excommunicated.

27. Grants an indulgence to those who pray for the pope.—Tom. xi. Conc. App. 2493.

Narbonne, 1551. NARBONNE. Held in 1551; Alexander Zerbinet, vicar-general of the cardinal-archbishop of Narbonne, presiding. Sixty-six canons were published, with a preface.

1. Contains a confession of faith.

The eight following relate to the qualifications of candidates for orders.

10. Forbids to ordain men who are the victims of any noxious disease, or who are maimed, or who cannot speak plainly.

13 to 24. Relate to the habits, life, &c., of the clergy; order the tonsure to be large; long dresses; forbid them to frequent taverns, to play with dice, &c.

27. Insists on residence.

36 and 37. Command the attendance of all parishioners at mass, and forbid preaching without the bishop's permission.

45. On the celebration of mass, the hours, and other divine services.

46 and 47. Forbid shows, dances, &c., in churches on festival days.

52. Directs medical men to exhort their patients to confess to their priests.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 5.

Narbonne, 1607. NARBONNE.—Held in 1607, by Louis de Vervins, archbishop of Narbonne, and seven other bishops. Forty-nine canons of faith and discipline, similar to those enacted in most of the synods held after the council of Trent, were published.

Canon 2. Forbids any person to have in the house or read, any Bible translated into the French tongue, without the bishop's consent in writing.

8. Orders that blasphemers of God and the saints shall be excommunicated.

9. Contains good directions for the observance of festivals.

37. Orders that the collection of money in church shall be made before the consecration, lest the congregation should be disturbed at such a moment.

39. Forbids dancing, and eating, and buying, and selling in churches; also forbids dogs in churches; orders cleanliness, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1573.

Neocesarea, NEOCESAREA (in Pontus). [*Concilium Neo-*

cesarense.] Held about the year 314, shortly after the council of Ancyra. It was composed, for the most part, of the same bishops who assisted at the latter, and Vitalis of Antioch is believed to have presided. Fifteen canons of discipline were published. in Pontus. about 314.

1. Enjoins the degradation of priests who marry after ordination.

2. Deprives of communion through life women, who having married two brothers, refuse to dissolve the marriage.

6. Permits to baptize women with child whenever they will.

7. Forbids priests to be present at the second marriage of any person.

8. Forbids to confer holy orders upon a layman whose wife has committed adultery; orders that if she has committed adultery after his ordination, he shall put her away, and declares that if he shall continue to live with her, he cannot retain the ministry committed to him.

11. Forbids to admit any one, however well qualified, to the priesthood under thirty years of age, because the Lord Jesus Christ at that age began his ministry.

13. Directs that, where both are present, the city priests shall celebrate the holy eucharist in preference to those from the country.

14. Declares that the Chorepiscopi are after the pattern of the Seventy, and permits them to offer.

15. Orders that there shall be seven deacons in every city, as is proved by the book of Acts.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 1480.

NESTERFIELD. [*Concilium Nesterfeldense.*] Held about the year 703, under Bertwald, archbishop of Canterbury, in which Wilfred of York was a second time deposed; he appealed to Rome, and his case was considered in a council held there in this year. [See C. of Rome, A.D. 678 and 703.]—*Inett, Orig. Anglicanæ*, vol. i. p. 133. Nesterfield, or Onestrefield, or Osterfield, 703.

NEWMARKET. [*Concilium apud Novum Mercatum.*] A council was held in July, 1161, by Henry II., king of England, in which Alexander III. was recognized as pope, and Victor the antipope condemned. Binius and others call this an English council; Labbe, on the contrary, states that it was held at Neufmarché, Newmarket, or Neufmarché, in Normandy, 1161.

in Normandy, in the diocese of Rouen.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1406.

New York, 1792. NEW YORK. Held in the autumn of 1792. Bishops Seabury, White, Provost, and Madison, were present. Dr. Claggett was consecrated bishop in Trinity church, being the first consecration performed in North America. The ordinal of the Church of England was reviewed, and, with some alterations, adopted. The principal difference of opinion existed with regard to the use of the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," and "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," in the Office of Ordination of Priests. Bishop Seabury strongly advocated the retention of the original form, without admitting the use of any alternative form. The latter arrangement was, however, agreed to.

An extraordinary scheme for effecting a union with the Methodists was broached by bishop Madison, but rejected.—*Bp. White, Memoirs*, pp. 30. 161.

New York, 1832. NEW YORK. A general convention of the Church in the United States of America was held in October, 1832, William White, D.D., bishop of Pennsylvania, presiding over eight bishops; in which fifty-six canons for the government of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America were drawn up.

1. Recognizes the three orders in the ministry.

2. On the election of bishops, was repealed in 1835.

3. Orders that every bishop elect shall, before consecration, produce to the house of bishops certain certificates of his election, from the convention by whom he is elected and others. Also contains the forms of testimonials to be given by the members of the diocesan convention, recommending the elect for consecration, and from the house of clerical and lay deputies in general convention. Further, orders that if the house of bishops consent to the consecration, the presiding bishop, with any two other bishops, shall proceed to consecrate, or any three bishops to whom he may communicate the testimonials.

4. Relates to the duties of standing committees.

5. Relates to the consecration of bishops during the recess of the general convention.

6. Permits the appointment of not more than one assistant bishop in a diocese, where the actual bishop is

incapacitated; the assistant bishop, in every case, to succeed to the bishopric upon the death of the actual bishop. New York, 1832.

7. Repealed by the third canon of 1838.

8. Forbids to confer deacons' orders on persons under twenty-one years; and priests' orders on persons under twenty-four; and to consecrate any one bishop under thirty years of age.

9. Repealed by the fourth canon of 1838.

10. Relates to the conduct required in candidates for holy orders.

11. Forbids any candidate for holy orders (being a lay-reader) to perform the service in the church without the bishop's licence, and in the latter case to use the absolution or benediction, and to wear the ministerial dress; directs that he shall officiate in the desk only and shall not read any sermon of his own composition; no such unordained person to perform any part of the service thus, except in cases of peculiar necessity.

12. Enacts that where a bishop has reason to believe that a candidate for holy orders has been refused in any other diocese, he shall make inquiry as to the justice of the refusal. Every bishop having rejected a candidate to notify the same to all the other bishops.

13. Repealed by the fifth canon of 1838.

14. Repealed by the fifth canon of 1841.

15. Relates to the testimonials to be required of candidates for holy orders.

16. Extends the operation of the aforesaid canon relating to candidates for holy orders to persons coming from those dioceses within the United States, in which the constitution of 1789 has not been acceded to.

17. Relates to deacons and their ordination.

18. Orders that candidates for priests' orders shall be examined in the presence of the bishop and two or more priests, on any leading studies prescribed by the house of bishops.

19. No person to be ordained priest without a sufficient title, or unless he be intended for a missionary, or be engaged as a professor, tutor, or instructor of youth in some college, &c.

20. Orders that ordinations shall be ordinarily held on the Sundays following the four Ember weeks.

21. Repealed by the third canon of 1835.

New York, 1832.

22. Relates to the ordination of clergymen for foreign parts.

23. Repealed by the sixth canon of 1841.

24. Relates to the case of clergymen coming from foreign countries, and called to officiate in churches in the American communion, in which Divine service is celebrated in a foreign language.

25. Relates to episcopal visitations; orders that they be made once in three years at least; the necessary expenses to be defrayed by the diocese so visited. Also orders the bishop to keep a register of his proceedings when visiting, and directs that the clergy in rotation shall supply the bishop's place in his absence in any parochial duties which belong to him.

26. Enacts that it shall be the duty of ministers to prepare persons for confirmation, to give notice of confirmation immediately upon receiving it themselves.

Also that it shall be the duty of the ministers and churchwardens to present to the bishop in visitation an account of the state of the congregation.

27. Orders that every bishop shall deliver a charge to his clergy at least once in three years, and that he shall from time to time also address pastoral letters to his people on some points of Christian doctrine, worship, or practice.

28. Orders parochial ministers to catechise diligently, and to inform the youth and others in the doctrines, constitution, and liturgy of the Church.

29. Declares it to be the duty of ministers to keep registers of baptisms, confirmations, communicants, marriages, and funerals, and to make out and continue a list of all families and adults under his care.

30. Is on the election and institution of ministers.

31. Forbids any clergyman, without permission, to officiate either by preaching, reading prayers, or otherwise, within the parochial care of another clergyman.

32. Provides for the resignation of bishops in extreme cases.

33. Relates to the dissolution of all pastoral connexion between ministers and their congregations. Forbids to dismiss a minister, or a minister to leave his congregation against their will, without the concurrence of the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese.

34. Controversies between the ministers and the

vestries and congregation of churches to be decided by the bishop and presbyter of the diocese, who may enforce the resignation of a minister upon reasonable conditions, when they deem the difference to be irreconcileable. New York, 1832.

35. Repealed by the fourth canon of 1835.

36. No person to be permitted to officiate without first producing evidence of his ordination as a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

37. Every minister to be liable to presentment and trial for any crime or gross immorality, and for violation of the constitution and canons of the Church, and on being found guilty, to be admonished, suspended, or degraded, according to the diocesan canons, until otherwise provided for by the general convention.

Section 2. Enacts that it shall be the duty of the bishop to inquire into the truth of any public rumour affecting the character of any clergyman, in order that further steps may be taken in that case against him.

38. Enacts that the bishop of the diocese shall displace from the ministry, in the presence of two or more clergymen, any minister declaring formally his renunciation of the ministry, and that he will no longer officiate; notice to be given of such displacement to every bishop.

39. Declares that when any one is degraded from the ministry, it is so entirely, and not merely from a higher to a lower order; that no degraded minister may be restored.

Notice of sentence of degradation to be sent without delay to every minister and vestry in the diocese, and also to every bishop or standing committee.

40. Relates to the case of a clergyman of any one diocese charged with misdemeanor in another.

41. Directs that "all persons within this Church shall celebrate and keep the Lord's day in hearing the word of God read and taught, in private and public prayer, in other exercises of devotion, and in acts of charity, using all godly and sober conversation."

42:—

(1.) Directs that wicked persons be repelled from the holy communion agreeably to the rubric.

(2.) Excuses the bishop to whom the minister repelling any one from the holy commnnion shall have given notice to that effect (according to the second rubric before the communion service), from instituting any

New York, 1832.

inquiry, unless he shall receive a written complaint from the party so repelled. If he receive such complaint, he shall either at once restore the party complaining to communion, or institute inquiry.

(3.) Declares that persons guilty of very heinous offences may be deprived of all privileges of Church membership.

43. Declares the union of a congregation within any diocese with any other diocese to be null and void.

44. Relates to the mode of publishing authorized editions of the standard Bible of the American Church.

45. Orders the use of the Book of Common Prayer on all occasions of public worship, and forbids the use of any other prayers than those prescribed by that book.

46. Repealed by the sixth council of 1835.

47. Permits the bishop of each diocese to compose forms of prayer and thanksgiving for extraordinary occasions, and orders that the clergy of such diocese shall use them.

48. Orders that the secretary of the house of clerical and lay deputies shall keep a register of all the clergy of the Church, whose names and cures shall be given to him at every general convention by the bishop or standing committee.

49. Declares the right of calling special meetings of the general convention to be in the bishops. The presiding bishop to call the meeting with consent of the majority.

(2.) Declares that ordinarily the place of meeting of the special general convention shall be fixed on by the preceding general convention for its next meeting.

(3.) Declares that the deputies elected to the preceding general convention shall, ordinarily, be deputies at the special convention.

50. Relates to the mode of transmitting notice of all matters submitted by the general convention to the consideration of the diocesan conventions.

51. Repealed by the seventh canon of 1835.

52. Directs that the alms and contributions of the holy communion shall be deposited with the minister of the parish, or other appointed by him, and by him applied to such pious and charitable uses as he shall think fit.

53. Of the requisites of a quorum.

54. Repealed by the 8th canon of 1835.

55. Relates to the general theological seminary.

56. Declares all former canons of this convention not included in these canons to be repealed.

NEW YORK. A general convention held in October, 1841; A. V. Griswold, D.D., bishop, presiding. Ten canons were published. New York, 1841.

1. Of the treasurer of the convention.

2. Of a clergyman absenting himself from his diocese. Declares that if he be absent during two years without sufficient cause given to his bishop, the latter may, with the consent of the clerical members of the standing committee, suspend him.

3. Of the election of a missionary bishop to the office of diocesan bishop.

4. Of the trial of bishops.

Section 1. Enacts that a bishop may be presented to the bishops of the Church by the convention of his diocese, or by any three bishops; for any crime or immorality, for heresy, or violation of the canons or constitutions of the Church or diocese: declares that two-thirds of the diocesan convention must concur in the presentment.

Section 2. Orders the presentment to be addressed to the presiding bishop, who shall appoint a special meeting of the other bishops, of whom seven shall be a quorum. If the presiding bishop be the subject of the presentment, it shall be addressed to the next bishop in the order of seniority.

5. Of the preparatory exercise of a candidate for deacon's orders. Orders three different examinations of the candidates in the presence of the bishop and two or more priests.

Section 4. Declares a clergyman liable to ecclesiastical censures for presenting a person for orders, without good grounds to believe that the requisitions of the canons have been complied with.

6. Of clergymen ordained by foreign bishops in communion with this Church, and desirous of officiating and settling in this Church. Orders such a clergyman before officiating, to exhibit to the minister or vestry a certificate signed by the bishop of the diocese, that his letters of orders are authentic, and given by some bishop in communion with the Church of America, and that he has given to the bishop sufficient evidence of his

New York, 1841.

pious and moral character and theological acquirements: and that in any case, before he can be permitted to settle in any church or parish, or be received into union with any diocese of the Church as a minister thereof, he must produce to the bishop a letter of dismission under the hand and seal of the bishop with whose diocese he was last connected (which letter must be in substance that provided for in section 1 of canon 4, 1835), and must be delivered within six months after date.

Declares that when a clergyman has been so received he shall be subject to all the canonical provisions of the American Church, and that he shall not be so received into union without first subscribing, in the presence of the bishop of the diocese and two or more presbyters, the declaration contained in the seventh article of the constitution, and satisfying the bishop of his theological attainments.

Declares, further, that he must have resided one year in the United States from the date of his letters of dismission, before he can be entitled to settle in any church as canonically in charge of the same.

Section 2. Declares that if such foreign clergyman be a deacon, he must reside in the United States at least three years, and so obtain the requisite testimonials before he can be ordained priest. Repeals 23rd canon of 1832.

7. Of ministers removing from one diocese to another.

8. Of the mode of securing an accurate view of the state of the Church from time to time. Orders every minister to present to his bishop on or before the first day of every annual convention, a statement of the number of baptisms, confirmations, marriages, and funerals, and of the number of communicants in his church. Such statements to be inserted in the journals of the house.

Section 2. Orders every bishop to state annually to the diocesan convention the names of the churches he has visited since the last convention, the number of persons confirmed, and of those who have been received as candidates for orders, ordained, suspended, or degraded, also the changes amongst the clergy. Such statement to be inserted in the journals of the convention.

Section 3. Orders that the journals of the different diocesan conventions shall be presented at the triennial general convention, together with such other papers as may tend to throw light upon the affairs of each diocese; and from these journals, &c., a report shall be drawn up by a committee appointed, which, when approved by the lower house, shall be sent up to the house of bishops, with a request that they will draw up and publish a pastoral letter to the members of the Church. New York, 1841.

9. Of candidates for holy orders. Every candidate to give notice to the bishop. No person having been once refused as a candidate in any diocese, or who, having been admitted, has ceased to be a candidate, to be admitted as a candidate in any other diocese without a certificate from the bishop of the former diocese, declaring the cause why he was refused, or for which he ceased to be a candidate.

Every candidate to produce a certificate from the standing committee of the diocese, stating that they have sufficient cause to believe him to be pious, sober, and honest, that he is attached to the doctrines, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and is a communicant in the same.

Testimonials to be laid before the standing committee to be signed by at least one presbyter and a respectable layman. In addition to such testimonials, satisfactory evidence to be given that the candidate is a graduate of some college, or that he has passed a sufficient examination before two presbyters appointed by the bishop in Natural and Moral Philosophy, Rhetoric, Latin, and the Greek Testament. Permits the knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin to be dispensed with under extraordinary circumstances in persons not under twenty-seven years of age.

Declares also what inward and spiritual qualifications the Church requires in candidates.

Orders the names of accepted candidates to be recorded by the bishop in a book, and forbids to ordain any until after the expiration of three years from that time, unless the bishop, with the consent of the standing committee, shall deem it expedient to ordain in peculiar cases after one year.

Admitted candidates may be transmitted to another diocese on letters dismissory.

Candidates who do not within three years after their admission, apply for their first and second examination, or within five years for their third examination, to cease to be candidates.

Repeals 4th canon of 1838.

10. Of clergymen ordained by bishops not in communion with this Church, and desirous of officiating or settling in this Church. Requires from such clergymen a satisfactory certificate from at least two presbyters of the American Church; and that they shall within six months after their application for admission, in the presence of the bishop and two presbyters, subscribe the declaration in the seventh article of the constitution; after which the bishop may receive him.

Nicea, 325, First Œcumenical Council.

NICEA. The first œcumenical council was held at Nicea, in Bithynia, in 325, by order of the emperor Constantine, to appease the troubles caused by the heresy of Arius. Constantine, anxious to bring all the members of the Church to one faith, determined to assemble an œcumenical council in which the controversy then raging might be terminated; he, therefore, caused letters to be addressed to all the bishops of the Catholic Church, inviting them to meet at Nicea, and promising that every thing necessary for their journey should be provided for them, and that he would himself be chargeable for all expenses.

The council was opened on the 19th of June, three hundred and eighteen bishops being present[4], besides a very large number of priests and deacons. The pope Sylvester not being able, on account of his advanced age, to attend personally, sent his legates, two priests named Vitus (or Victor) and Vincentius. Amongst the venerable names of those present, we find those of Hosius, bishop of Cordova, (whose signature appears first amongst the subscriptions to the acts of the council) Alexander of Alexandria, who brought with him S. Athanasius, his deacon, then a young man, S. Eustathius of Antioch, and S. Macarius of Jerusalem. Of these Hosius, Alexander, and Eustathius acted as the presidents of the council. Besides these bishops, there

[4] The number of bishops is variously given in the ancient writers; according to Eusebius, there were more than 250; Eustathius of Antioch, 270; S. Athanasius, 300, more or less; Sozomen, about 320; other accounts give 232. The general voice of the Church is in favour of the number 318.

were also present Paphnutius, bishop of Upper Thebais, Nicea, 325.
Potamon of Heraclea, Paul of Neocesarea, James of Nisibis, Amphion of Epiphania, Leontius, metropolitan of Cesarea in Cappadocia, (called by contemporary writers the ornament of the Church,) Hypatius of Gangra, Alexander of Constantinople, Protogenes of Sardica, and Alexander of Thessalonica. To these may be added Spiridion of Cyprus, Cæcilianus of Carthage, Nicholas of Myra in Lycia, and Eutychius of Amasea.

In this magnificent assembly some were remarkable by their wisdom and eloquence, others by their austere and rigid course of life, or their noble constancy in time of trial, many of them were distinguished by apostolic graces, many bore in their bodies the marks of their sufferings in the cause of Jesus Christ; some, as for instance, Paul of Neocesarea, had their hands cut off, others had been burnt, others again, with S. Paphnutius, had been deprived of an eye; in short, a large number of those present were confessors, who had in various ways suffered faithfully during the late persecutions.

But besides these holy men, there were other bishops (the number is said to have been but 22) who were supporters of Arius and his heresy, but who carefully concealed their errors, the most prominent of these were Eusebius of Cesarea in Palestine, Theodotus of Laodicea, Paulinus of Tyre, Gregory of Berytum, Aetius of Lydda, Theognis of Nicea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon.

The council having been opened on the 19th of June, a few days were occupied in preliminary discussions, previous to the solemn decision to be made in the emperor's presence. Arius himself was brought before the council, and questioned as to his faith and doctrine; he did not hesitate to maintain that the Son of God was a creature, made from nothing, that there was a time when He had no existence, that He was capable of His own free will of right and wrong. The bishops hearing these blasphemies with one accord stopped their ears, and cried out that such impious opinions were worthy of anathema together with their author.

On the 3rd of July, Constantine arrived at Nicea, and on the following day the bishops assembled in the hall of the palace, which had been prepared for the purpose. The emperor entered the assembly dressed in his imperial robes, but without guards, and accompanied only by

Nicea, 325. those of his ministers who were Christians; he evinced the greatest respect for the bishops, tempering, says Tillemont, by the humility of his mien, the splendour of the imperial majesty.

One of the bishops (probably Eustathius of Antioch) then addressed a discourse to him, in which he gave thanks to God for the blessings which He had been pleased to pour upon the emperor, who in his answer testified his joy at finding himself surrounded by such an august assembly, and exhorted the fathers to appease the divisions of the Church, declaring that he himself desired to appear in the council simply as one of the faithful, and that he freely left to the bishops the sole authority to settle the question of faith.

In the following sessions the detestable heresy which had destroyed the peace of the Church came under consideration, the emperor attended in person during the whole discussion; S. Athanasius, although at the time but a deacon, drew the attention of the whole council by his marvellous penetration in unravelling and laying open the artifices of the heretics; he resisted Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris, the chief supporters of Arius, and evinced such zeal in defence of the true faith, that he attracted both the admiration of all Catholics and the bitter hatred of the Arian party.

The confession of faith which Eusebius of Nicomedia, the protector and follower of Arius, presented to the council, was rejected, this confession condemned only the most gross and evident blasphemies of Arius, without at all touching upon others. The fathers then, after mature deliberation, and after having diligently consulted all that the holy Evangelists and Apostles have taught upon the subject, proceeded to set forth the true doctrine of the Church in the Nicene creed, in which, in order to defy all the subtilties of the Arians, the council thought good to express by the term "consubstantial," ὁμοούσιος, the Divine essence or substance which is common to the Father and the Son [5].

This celebrated confession of faith [6] was, according to

[5] Socrates, l. i. c. 5, says, that all the bishops except five; Baronius, that all except Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nicea, assented to the use of the word ὁμοούσιος. According to Cave, Secundus of Ptolemais, and Theognis of Marmorica, alone refused, and Eusebius signed.

[6] "Credimus in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, omnium visibilium

S. Athanasius, in a great measure composed by Hosius of Cordova. It was written out by Hermogenes, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, and subscribed, together with the condemnation of the dogmas and expressions of Arius, by all the bishops present with the exception of a few of the Arians. Nicea, 325.

The decision of the council having been laid before Constantine, he at once recognized in the unanimous consent of the bishops, the work of God, and received it with reverence, declaring that all those persons should be banished who refused to submit to it; upon which the Arians, through fear, also anathematized the dogmas condemned, and subscribed the faith laid down by the council; that they did so only outwardly was shown by their subsequent conduct. Arius however was banished by Constantine's order to Illyria, where he remained until his recall, which took place five years after.

The main object of the council being thus achieved, the fathers proceeded to determine other matters which were brought before them: First. They considered the subject of the Meletian schism, which for some time past had divided Egypt, and they decreed that Meletius should keep the title and rank of bishop in his see of Lycopolis in Egypt, forbidding him however to perform any episcopal functions; also that they whom he had elevated to any ecclesiastical dignities should be admitted to communion, upon condition that they should take rank after those who were enrolled in any parish [7] or church, and who had been ordained by Alexander. Second. They decreed that throughout the Church the festival of Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday after the full moon which happens next after the 21st of March. And, Third, They published twenty canons.

et invisibilium Creatorem. Et in Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei, natum ex Patre, et Unigenitum, hoc est, ex substantiâ Patris, Deum ex Deo, Lumen de Lumine, Deum verum ex Deo vero, genitum non factum, et consubstantialem Patri per quem omnia facta sunt, tam in Cœlis quam in terrâ. Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit, et incarnatus est et homo factus est; passus est, et resurrexit tertiâ die; et ascendit in cœlos, venturus inde ad judicandum vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum."

Eleven copies of this Creed in Greek are extant.

7 Παροικία, "parish:" the district under a bishop's jurisdiction, which we now call a "diocese," was so styled in the primitive Church.

Nicea, 325.

1. Excludes from the exercise of their functions those persons in holy orders who have made themselves eunuchs.

2. Forbids to raise neophytes to the priesthood or episcopate.

3. Forbids any bishop, priest, or deacon, to have women in their houses, except their mothers, sisters, aunts, or such women as shall be beyond the reach of slander.

4. Declares that a bishop ought if possible to be constituted by all the bishops of the province, but allows of his consecration by three at least with the consent of the absent bishops, signified in writing; the consecration to be finally confirmed by the metropolitan.

5. Orders that they who have been separated from the communion of the Church by their own bishop shall not be received into communion elsewhere. Also that a provincial synod shall be held twice a year in every province, to examine into sentences of excommunication. One synod to be held before Lent, and the second in Autumn.

6. Insists upon the preservation of the rights and privileges of the bishops[8] of Alexandria, Antioch, and other provinces.

7. Grants to the bishop of Ælia[9], according to ancient tradition, the second place of honour.

8. Permits those who had been ministers amongst the Cathari[1], and who returned into the bosom of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, having received imposition of hands, to remain in the rank of the clergy. Directs, however, that they shall, in writing, make profession to follow the decrees of the Church; and that they shall communicate with those who have married

[8] The sixth canon of Nicea, according to the version of Dionysius Exiguus, "Antiqua consuetudo servatur per Ægyptum, Libyam, et Pentapolim, ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem; quia et urbis Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem et apud Antiochiam ceterasque Provincias suis privilegia serventur Ecclesiis. Illud autem generaliter clarum est quod si quis præter Metropolitani sententiam fuerit factus Episcopus, hunc magna synodus definivit Episcopum esse non oportere," &c.

[9] Ælia Capitolina, the new city built by Ælius Hadrianus upon the site of Jerusalem, or near to it.

[1] "Cathari:" a sect of the Novatians, who, as their name implies (like our own Puritans), affected an extreme degree of purity.

twice, and with those who have performed penance for relapsing in time of persecution. Directs, further, that in places where there is a Catholic bishop and a converted bishop of the Cathari, the former shall retain his rank and office, and the latter be considered only as a priest; or the bishop may assign him the place of a chorepiscopus. Nicea, 325.

9. Declares to be null and void the ordination of priests made without due inquiry, and of those who have, before ordination, confessed sins committed.

10. Declares the same of persons ordained priests in ignorance, or whose sin has appeared after ordination.

11. Enacts that those who have fallen away in time of persecution without strong temptation, shall be three years among the hearers, seven among the prostrators, and for two years shall communicate with the people without offering [2].

12. Imposes ten years' penance upon any one of the military, who, having been deprived of a post on account of the faith, shall, after all, give a bribe, and deny the faith, in order to receive it back again.

13. Forbids to deny the holy communion to any one likely to die.

14. Orders that catechumens who have relapsed shall be three years among the hearers.

15. Forbids bishops, priests, or deacons to remove from one city to another: any one offending against this canon, to be compelled to return to his own church, and his translation to be void.

16. Priests or deacons removing from their own church, not to be received into any other; those who persist, to be separated from communion. If any bishop dare to ordain a man belonging to another church, the ordination to be void.

17. Directs that clerks guilty of usury shall be deposed.

18. Forbids deacons to give the eucharist to priests, and to receive it themselves before the priests, and to sit among the priests; offenders to be deposed.

19. Directs that Paulianists [3] coming over to the

[2] "Communicate with the people in prayer, without being admitted to the oblation;" i. e. to the holy eucharist, according to Johnson's way of understanding it.

[3] "Paulianists:" the followers of Paul of Samosata, condemned at Antioch. See council of ANTIOCH, A. D. 264. They did not baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Church, shall be baptized again. Permits those amongst their clergy who are without reproach, after baptism, to be ordained by the Catholic bishops: orders the same thing of deaconesses.

20. Orders that all persons shall offer up their prayers on Sundays and Pentecost[4] *standing*.

It was also proposed to add another canon, enjoining continence upon the married clergy; but S. Paphnutius warmly opposed the imposition of such a yoke, and prevailed, so that the proposal fell to the ground.—*Soc.* l. i. c. xi. *Soz.* l. i. c. xxiii. Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 1—63, &c. *Hammond, Canons of the Church.*

Nicea, 787, falselystyled Seventh Œcumenical.

NICEA. Held September 24, 787[5], by the empress Irene and her son Constantine. Three hundred and seventy-five bishops were present from Greece, Thrace, Natolia, the Isles of the Archipelago, Sicily, and Italy. Pope Hadrian and all the oriental patriarchs sent legates to represent them in the synod, those of Rome taking the first place: two commissioners from the emperor and empress also assisted at it. The causes which led to the assembling of this council were briefly as follows. The emperor Leo (and afterwards his son Constantine Copronymus), offended at the excess of veneration often offered to the images of our Lord and the saints, made a decree against the use of images in any way, and caused them everywhere to be removed and destroyed. These violent and ill-advised proceedings raised an opposition almost as violent, and both the patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, and the pope (Hadrian) defended the use of images, declaring them to have been always in use in the churches, and showing the difference between *absolute* and *relative* worship. However, in a council assembled at Constantinople in 754, composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, a decree was published against the use of images. But at this time Constantine Copronymus died, and Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, induced the empress Irene and her son Constantine to

[4] Pentecost here denotes the whole of the fifty days from Easter to Whitsuntide.

[5] This council was originally convoked to Constantinople, in the preceding year, and was opened on the 17th of August; but owing to the tumults raised by the Iconoclast party, it was dissolved.

convoke this council, in which the decrees of the council of 754 at Constantinople were set aside. Nicea, 787.

The first session was held on the 24th September [6], in the church of S. Sophia. Tarasius, the patriarch, spoke first, and exhorted the bishops to reject all novelties, and to cling to the traditions of the Church. After this, ten bishops were brought before the council, accused of following the party of the Iconoclasts. Three of whom, Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodosius of Amorium recanted, and declared that they received with all honour the relics and sacred images of Jesus Christ, the blessed Virgin, and the saints; upon which they were permitted to take their seats: the others were remanded to the next session. The 42nd of the apostolical canons, and the 8th of Nicea, and other canons relating to the reception of converted heretics, were read. Session I. Sept. 24,

In the second session the letters of pope Hadrian to the empress and to the patriarch Tarasius were read. The latter then declared his entire concurrence in the view taken of the question by the bishop of Rome, viz. that images are to be adored with a relative worship, reserving to God alone faith and the worship of Latria. This opinion was warmly applauded by the whole council. Session II. Sept. 26.

In the third session the confession of Gregory of Neocesarea, the leader of the Iconoclast party, was received, and declared by the council to be satisfactory; whereupon he was, after some discussion, admitted to take his seat, and with him the bishops mentioned above. Then the letters of Tarasius to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and their replies, as well as the confession of Theodore of Jerusalem, were read, and approved. Session III. Sept. 28.

The passages of Holy Scripture relating to the cherubim which overshadowed the ark of the covenant, and which ornamented the interior of the temple, were read, together with other passages taken from the fathers, showing that God had, in other days, worked miracles by means of images [7]. Session IV. Oct. 1.

[6] Theophanes, who was present, says that the opening of the council was made on the 11th of October.

[7] An account was read of a miracle said to have occurred in Syria, where certain Jews, having nailed an image of our blessed Lord to a cross, with much insult proceeded to strike a lance into the side, from which blood and water copiously flowed.

Nicea, 787. Session V. Oct. 20.

In the fifth session the patriarch Tarasius endeavoured to show that the innovators, in their endeavour to destroy all images, were following in the steps of the Jews, pagans, Manichæans, and other heretics. The council then came to the conclusion that the images should be restored to their usual places, and be carried in processions as before.

Session VI. Oct. 5th or 6th.

In the sixth session the refutation of the definition of faith made in the council of Iconoclasts at Constantinople, was read. They had there declared that the eucharist was the only image allowed of our Lord Jesus Christ; but the fathers of the present synod, in their refutation, maintained that the eucharist is no where spoken of as the *image* of our Lord's Body, but as the very Body itself.

After this, the fathers replied to the passages from Holy Scripture and from the fathers, which the Iconoclasts had adduced in support of their views, and in doing so, insisted chiefly upon perpetual tradition and the infallibility of the Church.

Session VII. and last. Oct. 13.

In the seventh session a definition of faith was read, which was to this effect. "We decide that the holy images, whether painted or graven, or of whatever kind they may be, ought to be exposed to view. Whether in churches, upon the sacred vessels and vestments, upon walls, or in private houses, or by the wayside. Since the oftener Jesus Christ, his blessed mother, and the saints are seen in their images, the more will men be led to think of the originals, and to love them. Salutation and the adoration of honour ought to be paid to images, but not the worship of *Latria*, which belongs to God alone: nevertheless it is lawful to burn lights before them, and to incense them, as is usually done with the cross, the books of the gospels, and other sacred things, according to the pious use of the ancients. For honour so paid to the image is transmitted to the original, which it represents. Such is the doctrine of the holy fathers, and the tradition of the Catholic Church; and we order that they who dare to think or teach otherwise, if bishops or other clerks, shall be deposed; if monks or laymen, shall be excommunicated." This decree was signed by the legates and all the bishops.

Session VIII. Oct. 23,

Another session[8] was held at Constantinople, to

[8] This session was not recognized, either by Greeks or Latins.

which place the bishops had been cited by the empress Irene, who was present, with her son Constantine, and addressed the assembly. The decree of the council and the passages from the fathers read at Nicea, were repeated, and the former was again subscribed. The council of Constantinople against image worship was anathematized, and the memory of Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus, and George of Cyprus held up to veneration. Twenty-two canons of discipline were published. at Constantinople.

1. Insists upon the proper observation of the canons of the Church.

2. Forbids to consecrate those who do not know the psalter, and will not promise to observe the canons.

3. Forbids princes to elect bishops.

7. Forbids to consecrate any church or altar in which relics are not contained.

14. Forbids those who are not ordained to read in the synaxis from the Ambon.

15 and 16. Forbid plurality of benefices, and luxury in dress amongst the clergy.

20. Forbids *double* monasteries, for men and for women.

This council was not for a long period recognized in France. The grounds upon which the French bishops opposed it are contained in the celebrated Caroline Books, written by order of Charlemagne. Their chief objections were these. 1. That no western bishops, except the pope, by his legates, were present. 2. That the decision was contrary to their custom, which was to use images, but not in any way to worship them. 3. That the council was not assembled from all parts of the Church, nor was its decision in accordance with that of the Catholic Church.

The Caroline books were answered by pope Adrian, but with little effect as far as the Gallican Church was concerned, which continued long after this to reject this council altogether. See C. Frankfort, a. d. 794.— Tom. vii. Conc. pp. 1—963.

NID. [*Concilium Niddanum.*] Held in 705, near the river Nid in Northumbria, by Bertwald of Canterbury, assisted by Bosa, bishop of York, John of Hagustald, and Eadfrid of Lindisfarn; several abbots, and the abbess S. Elfrida, (daughter of Oswy, king of Northumberland), being also present, with Wilfred, whom Bosa had succeeded in the bishopric of York. Wilfred was Nid, 705.

reconciled with the other bishops of the province, but it does not appear that he was restored to his bishopric[9], which Bosa retained until his death, and after him John of Hagustald (or Hexham) was translated thither.—*Eddius*, cap. 57. Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1389. *Wilkins*, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 67.

Nismes, 1096. NISMES. [*Concilium Nemausense.*] Held in July, 1096, by pope Urban II., who presided, assisted by four cardinals and several bishops. Sixteen canons were published, which are for the most part the same with those of the council of Clermont, which the pope confirmed in all subsequent councils.

Canon 2. Is directed against those who assert that it is not lawful for monks to exercise sacerdotal functions.

12. Forbids the marriage of little girls (puellulæ) under twelve years of age.

Mansi declares that the matter of the clergy of S. Saturninus at Toulouse, who claimed the fourth part of the oblations made in that church, which canonically belonged to the bishop, and was opposed by the bishop Isarne, was discussed in this council; no decision was pronounced in the synod, but subsequently Urban II. compelled Isarne to give way. Moreover, in this council king Philip, after having promised to quit Bertrade, was absolved. [See C. of Tours, 1096.]—Tom. x. Conc. p. 604.

Nismes, 1284. NISMES. Held about the year 1284. A long constitution was drawn up, relating to holy baptism, penance, the holy eucharist, the celebration of the mass, reverence due to churches, alienation of church property, the conduct of the clergy, wills, burials, tithes, marriages, excommunications and interdicts, perjury, the Jews, and other matters. This was only a diocesan synod—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1200.

Nogara, in Lower Armagnac, 1315. NOGARA. [*Concilium Nugaroliense.*] Held in 1315, by William de Flavacour, archbishop of Auch; six bishops and the deputies of others absent; five articles were published, of which

3. Condemns the abuse of refusing the sacrament of penance to persons condemned to death who desire it.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1620.

Northampton, 1164. NORTHAMPTON. [*Concilium Northamptoniense.*]

[9] Johnson says that he was put into possession of the bishopric of Hexham, which had been erected out of the revenues of a monastery founded there by himself.

Held October 13th, 1164, in which S. Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, accused by the king of perjury, was condemned by the bishops and others present, who were by a royal edict threatened with mutilation and other penalties, and even with death, in the event of their supporting the archbishop. The latter appealed to the pope, who alone, under God, he maintained had authority to judge him.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1433. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 435.

Northampton, 1176.

NORTHAMPTON. Held in 1176, by Cardinal Legate Hugo. The articles of Clarendon were renewed, and leave was given to the king by the cardinal to implead clergymen in the temporal courts for killing deer, &c., in the royal parks and forests. The council was attended by most of the Scotch bishops and abbots, and the question of the archbishop of York's right of primacy over Scotland was discussed: Dr. Gilbert Murray (afterwards bishop of Caithness and chancellor) strongly and successfully opposed it.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1469. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 483.

Northampton, 1265.

NORTHAMPTON. Held November 2nd, 1265, by cardinal Octobonus, the Roman legate. In this council all the bishops and priests who had taken part with Simon, earl of Leicester, were excommunicated, the following by name: John of Winchester, Walter of Worcester, Henry of London, and Stephen of Chester; of these, Walter died very shortly after, but the other three appealed from this sentence to Rome.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 762. *Mansi*, note. *Raynal*, vol. iii. p. 181.

Noyon, 1233.

NOYON. [*Concilium Noviomense.*] Held in the first week in Lent, in consequence of a dispute between the king and Milo, bishop of Beauvais. The latter complained that the king, S. Louis, had violated his rights by bringing to punishment, in Beauvais, certain incendiaries who had raised a sedition there, in which murder had been committed. The bishops laid the province under an interdict, upon which the cathedral chapters made complaint that it had been done without their consent, and in a council held at S. Quentin, on the Sunday before Christmas, at which eight bishops were present, the interdict was suspended. From this decision the bishop of Beauvais appealed to the pope, but he dying before the question could be settled, it was not until some years after that his successor confirmed the removal of the interdict, and made peace with S. Louis.

Five councils were held upon the subject in this year. —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 446. *Mansi*, note. *Raynald*, ii. p. 48.

Noyon, 1344.

NOYON. Held July 26th, 1344, by John of Vienne, archbishop of Rheims, and six bishops. Seventeen canons were published, relating chiefly to ecclesiastical immunities and the defence of the clergy.

4. Directs that in all churches Divine service shall be conducted after the example of the cathedral church.

5. Excommunicates those lords who forbid their vassals to buy and sell with ecclesiastics, and to till their lands.

8. Directs that those clerks who submit voluntarily to the sentence of the secular judges, and who pay the fines inflicted upon them by such judges, shall be punished.

12. Forbids priests and other ecclesiastics, &c., publicly to solemnize (ut solemnizent in publico) miracles which they assert to have recently been done, without the consent of the ordinary.

13. Excommunicates those lords who stripped off the vestments and shaved the heads of ecclesiastics accused of crimes.

14. Excommunicates lay-persons who pretended to be clerks and assumed the tonsure.

17. Condemns the exorbitant exactions of the proctors in the ecclesiastical courts.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1899.

Nymphœum in Bithynia, 1234.

NYMPHŒUM. [*Concilium Nymphœense.*] Held in April, 1234, under the emperor John, who was then at Nymphœum.

In 1233, Gregory IX. sent four legates to Germanus, the patriarch of Constantinople, in order, if possible, to effect an union between the Churches.

The legates, who did not arrive before the beginning of the year 1234, were received with much honour, deputies from the emperor and the patriarch meeting them on the road. They first held a disputation with the Greeks at Nicea, after which they proceeded to Constantinople to abide the issue of a conference between the four oriental patriarchs. They were then invited to a conference at Nymphœum, where a discussion was again opened upon the two subjects of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the use of unleavened bread in the holy eucharist. The

legates proved that the words "filio que" were used rather in *explanation* than as an *addition*, showing both from Holy Scripture and from the Fathers that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father. The Greeks did not accuse the Latins of error in doctrine, and the legates therefore maintained that it was lawful for the Latin Church to confess with the mouth what it was lawful for her to believe. The emperor, in order to effect an union, proposed that each party should give way on one point, that the Greeks should approve the Latin use in consecrating, and that the Latins should expunge from the creed the words "filio que," which gave offence to the Greeks; this however the legates vehemently refused to do. "If you ask us," said they to the emperor, "how peace is to be made, we will answer you in a few words: concerning the Body of Christ, we declare that you must firmly believe, and moreover preach, that it may be consecrated either in leavened or unleavened bread, and we require that all the books written on your part against this faith shall be condemned and burnt. Concerning the Holy Spirit, we declare that you must believe that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father, and that you must preach this faith to the people; we do not say that the pope will compel you to chant these words in the creed if you object to do so, but all books written against this doctrine must be burnt." When the emperor heard these words he answered angrily, that he had expected to receive from them some propositions more likely to lead to peace, but he would repeat what they had said to the Greek bishops. The latter were moved with great indignation at the proposal, and all further negociations upon the subject were broken off.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 460.

O.

ST. OMER. [*Concilium Audomarense.*] Held in June 1099, by Manassez of Rheims, and four of his suffragans. The "Treve de Dieu" was established, and at the entreaty of Robert, count of Flanders, articles of peace were drawn up in five articles.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 618. *Baluze.* St. Omer, 1099.

ONESTREFIELD, or OSTERFIELD. [See NESTERFIELD.]

Orange, 441.

ORANGE. [*Concilium Arausicanum.*] Held November 8th, 441; S. Hilary of Arles presided; seventeen bishops were present from three provinces, amongst them Eucherius of Lyons, Ingenius of Embrun, Claudius (bishopric unknown), and Maximus of Riez. Thirty canons were published.

1. Declares that priests may, in the bishop's absence, confirm (by administering the holy chrism and the blessing) heretics, who, being in danger of death, desire to be reconciled.

2. Directs that ministers, when about to baptize shall have the chrism ready, with which they shall anoint the Neophytes immediately after baptism, according to their custom of only anointing with the chrism once. That if any one by chance shall not have been anointed with the chrism of baptism, it shall be made known to the bishop at confirmation, but not as being absolutely necessary, since there being but one benediction of the chrism, that which is given to the baptized person at confirmation is sufficient[1].

3. Directs that penitents when dangerously ill shall be received to communion without the imposition of hands; that if they survive they shall remain in a state of penance until, having fully accomplished it, they may rightly receive the communion after reconciliation by imposition of hands.

[1] The words of this canon, according to the reading of Sirmondus, are as follow:—"Nullum Ministrorum, qui baptizandi recepit officium, sine Chrismate usquam debere progredi, quia inter nos placuit semel Chrismari. De eo autem qui in baptismate, quacunque necessitate faciente, non Chrismatus fuerit, in confirmatione sacerdos commonebitur. Nam inter quoslibet Chrismatis ipsius non nisi una benedictio est; non ut præjudicans quidquam, sed ut non necessaria habeatur repetita Chrismatio."

"This," says Sirmondus, "means that the chrism is to be applied once only, and that the minister ought, therefore, to have it ready, in order to anoint the baptized person at once; but if it shall by any chance be omitted, the bishop ought to be informed of it, that he may anoint the person at confirmation; but that two unctions, viz. one at baptism and a second at confirmation, are not required, there being but one benediction of the chrism."

Petrus Aurelius, however, maintained that the end of the canon should be read thus: "Sed ut necessaria habeatur repetita chrismatio;" and the question was warmly disputed between them. The opinion of Aurelius had most supporters at first; but that of Sirmondus has gradually gained ground, and has the support of most of the learned, and of the best MSS. See Natalis Alexander, De Sancto Confirmationis, § xiii.

4. Directs that penance be permitted to those clerks who desire it. Orange, 441.

5. Forbids to deliver up criminals who have taken refuge in a church.

6. Excommunicates those who seize upon the slaves of the clergy in the place of their own, who have taken sanctuary in the church.

7. Excommunicates those who treat persons set free by the Church as slaves.

8. Forbids a bishop to ordain any one living in another diocese.

9. Directs that if a bishop shall desire to ordain persons belonging to another Church, of irreproachable character, he shall either bring them to live in his own Church, or obtain leave of their own bishop.

10. Directs that where a bishop has built a church within the territory of another bishop with the latter's permission, he shall suffer him to consecrate it, and the bishop of the place shall on his part grant to the bishop who built the church the right of ordaining, as clerks to serve it, such persons as the bishop of the place shall present to him, or of approving his choice if they be already ordained.

11. Forbids bishops to receive persons excommunicated by their own bishop until they are reconciled.

12. Directs that persons suddenly deprived of the power of speech shall be reconciled or baptized if they give, or shall have given beforehand, a sign that they wish it.

13. Directs that all pious offices[2] be performed towards insensible persons.

14. Directs that the communion shall be given to baptized Energumens, who do all in their power to become healed, and who follow obediently the counsels of the clergy, because the virtue of the sacrament may strengthen them against the attacks of the devil and purify them.

15. Direets that in cases of necessity holy baptism may be administered to Energumens.

16. Forbids to ordain those who have been openly possessed by an evil spirit, and deprives of all their functions those who become so after ordination.

17. Dirccts that the chalice be offered with the

[2] Quæcumque pietatis sunt.

Orange, 441.

"capsa," and be consecrated with the eucharistical mixture [3].

18. Orders that thenceforwards, in all the churches of the provinces the gospel should be read to the Catechumens.

19. Forbids Catechumens to enter the baptistery.

20. Forbids to suffer Catechumens to receive the blessing with the faithful, even in family prayers, and directs that they be warned to come separately for the blessing, and to receive the sign of the cross.

21. Enacts that in the case of two bishops only consecrating a bishop, without the participation of the other bishops of the province, if the bishop was consecrated against his own will he shall be put into the place of one of the consecrating bishops, and some one consecrated to fill the place of the latter; but if his consecration was done with his own free consent, he shall be deposed, as well as the two consecrating bishops.

22. Declares that in future married men shall not be ordained deacons, except they will make a vow of chastity.

23. Directs that married deacons who will not live in a state of continence be deprived.

24. Excepts from this law those who had been previously ordained, but forbids to confer any higher order upon them.

25. Forbids to elevate a person twice married to any higher degree than that of subdeacon.

26. Forbids the ordination of deaconesses in future, and directs that those actually ordained shall receive the benediction together with lay persons.

27. Directs that the widows shall make profession of chastity and wear the proper dress.

28. Directs that they who have broken their profession of virginity shall be put to penance.

29. Confirms the regulation of the council.

30. Directs that when a bishop is unable to discharge his duties, he shall commit the performance of them to another bishop, and not to a mere priest.

In this council, moreover, certain bishops were censured, who had broken the canons of the council of Riez in 439, by refusing to allow the annual provincial

[3] "Cum capsa et calix offerendus est et admixtione eucharistiæ consecrandus."

councils with the others as ordered.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1446.

ORANGE. Held July 3rd, 529; Cesarius of Arles presided, at the head of thirteen bishops. Twenty-five articles concerning grace and free will, and directed against the semi-Pelagian doctrines, then prevalent, were drawn up and signed, and subsequently confirmed by pope Bonifacius II. Orange, 529.

1. Condemns those who maintain that the sin of Adam has affected only the body of man by rendering it mortal, and has not affected the soul also.

2. Condemns those who maintain that the sin of Adam hath injured himself only, or that the death of the body is the only effect of his transgression which has descended to his posterity.

3. Condemns those who teach that grace is given in answer to the prayer of man, and who deny that it is *through grace* that he is brought to pray at all.

4. Condemns those who teach that God waits for our wish before purifying us from sin, and that He does not by His Spirit give us the wish to be purified.

5. Condemns those who maintain that the act of faith, by which we believe in Him who justifieth, is not the work of grace, but that we are capable of doing so of ourselves.

7. Condemns those who maintain that man can think or do any thing good, as far as his salvation is concerned, without grace.

8. Condemns those who maintain that some come to the grace of baptism by their own free will, and others by the supernatural help of Divine mercy.

The seventeen other canons are, properly speaking, sentences taken out of the works of SS. Augustin and Prosper, recognizing the necessity of grace, prayer, and humility. To these twenty-five canons were appended three propositions, viz.—

(1.) That all baptized persons can, if they will, work out their salvation.

(2.) That God hath predestinated no one to damnation.

(3.) That God, by His grace, gives to us the first beginning of faith and charity, and that He is the Author of our conversion.—Tom. iv. p. 1666.

ORLEANS. [*Concilium Aurelianense.*] Held July 10th, 511, by order of Clovis, the archbishops of Orleans, 511.

Orleans, 511. Bordeaux, Bourges, Auch, Tours, and Rouen, were present, with twenty-seven bishops, amongst whom were Quintianus, bishop of Rodez, near Clermont, Melanius, bishop of Rennes, and Theodosius of Auxerre. Thirty-one canons were published.

1. Establishes the inviolability of churches as places of refuge.

3. Declares that a runaway slave taking refuge in a church shall be given up to his master, an oath having been first made by the latter not to hurt him.

4. Forbids to ordain lay persons without the king's permission. The children of clerks are left to the bishop's discretion.

5. Directs that the revenue arising from property given to any church by the prince shall be employed (1) in the repair of the building, (2) for the support of the clergy, (3) for the relief of the poor, and (4) for the redemption of slaves.

7. Forbids clerks and monks to go to the prince to obtain favours without letters from their bishop.

8. Enacts that a bishop wilfully ordaining a slave unknown to his master shall pay twice his price to the master.

12. Permits deacons and priests in a state of penance to baptize in cases of necessity.

13. Forbids the wife of a priest or deacon to marry.

17. Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all churches built within his territory.

18. Forbids to marry a brother's widow, or a sister's widower.

19. Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all abbots, and directs that they shall attend him once a year at the place which he shall appoint.

20. Forbids monks to use the stole or handkerchief ("tzangas") within their monasteries.

21. Declares a monk who shall leave his monastery and marry to be for ever excluded from taking orders.

24. Orders a fast of forty, and not fifty, days before Easter.

27 and 28. Order the proper observation of the Rogation days.

29. Forbids all familiarity between clerks and women.

30. Excommunicates all who have dealings with diviners.

31. Enjoins bishops to attend the offices of the

church every Sunday in the nearest place of worship.—*Pagi in Baronius*, A. D. 507, x. xii. Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1403.

ORLEANS. Held in 533, on the 24th of May, by order of Theodoric, Childebert, and Clotaire, the three kings of France; twenty-six archbishops and bishops attended from the provinces, Lyons, and Aquitaine. Twenty-one canons were published against simony and other abuses, most of which were old regulations renewed:— Orleans, 533.

The 12th warns those persons who have made a vow to drink, and sing, and frolic in any church, that they ought not to fulfil their vow.

13. Forbids abbots, chaplains, recluses, and priests to give letters dimissory to clerks.

15. Forbids to accept the bequests of suicides; permits those of persons killed in the commission of any crime.

20. Commands that they be excluded from communion who have eaten of meats offered to idols, or of things strangled, &c.

21. Excommunicates abbots who despise the orders of their bishops.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1779.

ORLEANS. Held May 7th, 538; nineteen bishops attended, amongst whom were Lupus of Lyons, who presided, Pantathagus of Vienne, Leo of Sens, &c. Thirty-three canons were published. Orleans, 538.

1. Orders that a metropolitan who shall permit two years to pass without convoking a provincial synod shall be suspended from celebrating mass for one year, and also those bishops who neglect to attend it without just hindrance.

3. Directs that metropolitans be consecrated by a metropolitan in the presence of all the bishops of the province, and the bishops of each province by the metropolitan.

7. Directs that clerks who have received orders of their own free will shall, if they marry afterwards, be excommunicated, that if they were ordained without their own consent they shall be only deposed; that clerks committing adultery shall be shut up in a monastery for life, without however being deprived of communion.

25. Orders that persons who fall back from a state of penance into a worldly life shall be deprived of communion until at the point of death.

28. Forbids to work in the fields on Sunday, but permits travelling on horseback or in a carriage, the preparation of food, and all things needful for the proper neatness of house and person; the denial of which things it states to belong rather to the Jewish than the Christian observance of the day.

29. Forbids lay-persons to leave church at mass before the end of the Lord's prayer, or if a bishop be present, before he have given his blessing.

30. Forbids Jews to mix with Christians from Holy Thursday to Easter Day.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 294.

Orleans, 541. ORLEANS. Held in 541. Thirty-eight bishops and the deputies of twelve absent attended; Leontius, archbishop of Bordeaux, presided. Thirty-eight canons were published; most of them similar to those published in the preceding councils, the following are amongst those which differ.

1. Orders the celebration of Easter every year according to the table of Victorius (or Victor).

4. Orders that no one at the oblation of the holy chalice shall presume to offer anything but wine mixed with water, because it is held as sacrilegious to offer anything different from what the Saviour instituted in his most holy commandments.

16. Excommunicates those who swear, after the fashion of pagans, upon the heads of beasts, or who invoke the names of false gods.

33. Declares that any person desirous of having a parish upon his property, must, in the first place, give a sufficient endowment for the clerks who shall serve it. Such is supposed to have been the origin of church patronage.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 380.

Orleans, 549. ORLEANS. Held October 28, 549, by Childebert, king of France. Fifty bishops (amongst whom were ten afterwards reverenced as saints) and twenty-one deputies of those who were absent attended, collected from the three kingdoms of France and all the provinces of the Gauls, except that of Narbonne, which was still in the occupation of the Goths. Sacerdos, bishop of Lyons, presided. Twenty-four canons, for the most part renewing those of the preceding councils, were published.

1. Condemns the errors of Eutyches and Nestorius.

2. Forbids excommunication for small offences.

6. Forbids to ordain a slave without the master's consent.

11. Forbids to give the people a bishop whom they dislike, and declares that neither the people nor clergy ought to be intimidated in making their election.

20 and 21. Directs that archdeacons shall visit prisoners every Sunday, and that bishops shall take care of lepers.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 390.

Orleans, 1022 (or 1017, *Labbe*).

ORLEANS. Held in 1022, by king Robert; at which several bishops were present. Several Manichæans were condemned to be burned; amongst whom were Stephen (or Heribert) and Lysoye, ecclesiastics of Orleans.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 836. *Spicil.* p. 740.

Oviedo, 877.

OVIEDO. [*Concilium Ovetense.*] Held about 877, according to Pagi[4]. King Alphonso, his queen and sons were present, and eighteen bishops. Several useful regulations were drawn up. The church of Oviedo was erected into a metropolitan see, and Hermenegilde, who presided over it, was recognized as head over the other bishops, to labour with them for the re-establishment of discipline in the Church, which had been impaired by the rule of the infidels.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 501.

Oxford, 1160 (or 1166, *Wilkins*).

OXFORD. [*Concilium Oxoniense.*] Held in 1160, in which more than thirty heretics of the sect of the Vaudois or Publicani, who had lately come over into England, headed by one Gerard, and who denied baptism, the holy Eucharist, and marriage, and who set at nought the authority of the Church, were condemned, and given over to the secular arm; upon which they were sentenced to be branded in the forehead, and publicly flogged out of the city, and were forbidden to remain in that neighbourhood. They appear to have made but one convert, a woman, who soon returned into the Church.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1404. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 438.

Oxford, 1207.

OXFORD. King John, on his return from abroad, assembled a large number of his clergy and barons, first at London, and subsequently at Oxford, demanding a certain portion of the ecclesiastical revenues, but this was unanimously refused.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 515.

Oxford, 1222.

OXFORD. Held at the monastery of Osney, near

[4] Mansi says that the date of this council is altogether uncertain.

Oxford, 1222. Oxford, on the 11th of June, by Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury and cardinal legate, who presided. This was a council of all England, and fifty canons were published in conformity with those of the council of Lateran of 1215.

1. Excommunicates generally all who encroach upon the rights of the Church, disturb the public peace, &c.

2. Directs that bishops shall retain about them wise and charitable almoners, and attend to the petitions of the poor; that they shall also at times themselves hear and make confessions; that they shall reside at their cathedrals, &c. &c.

3. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and deans to take anything for collations or institutions to benefices.

6. Orders the celebration of the nocturnal and diurnal office, and of all the sacraments, especially those of baptism and of the altar.

7. Forbids priests to say mass more than once in the same day, except at Christmas and Easter, and when there was a corpse to be buried.

10. Orders curates to preach often, and to attend to the sick.

11. Directs that the ornaments and vessels of the church be properly kept, and that in every church there shall be a silver chalice and a clean white linen cloth for the altar; also that old corporals be burnt, &c.

12. Forbids any one to resign his benefice, retaining the vicarage, to prevent suspicion of unlawful bargain.

13. Forbids to divide benefices in order to provide for several persons.

15. Orders churches not worth more than five marks a year, to be given to none but such as will reside and minister in them.

16. Assigns to the perpetual vicar a stipend *not less* than five marks, except in Wales, "where vicars are content with less by reason of the poverty of the churches." Orders that the diocesan shall decide whether the parson or vicar shall bear the charges of the church.

17. Orders that in large parishes there shall be two or three priests.

18. Directs that the bishop shall make the person presented to a living, take an oath, that he has neither given nor promised anything to the patron.

19. Provides that in each archdeaconry confessors

shall be appointed for the rural-deans and others of the clergy who may be unwilling to confess to the bishop. Oxford, 1222.

20. Takes from the rural-deans the cognizance of matrimonial causes.

21. Forbids, under anathema, to harbour thieves, &c.

22 and 23. Relate to archidiaconal visitations. Forbid those dignitaries to burden the clergy whom they visit with many horses, to invite strangers to the procurations provided for them, and to extort procurations without reasonable cause.

24. Forbids to let out to farm archdeaconries, deaneries, &c.

25. Orders the archdeacons to take care in their visitations that the canon of the mass be correct, that the priest can rightly pronounce the words of the canon and of baptism, that laymen be taught how to baptize rightly in case of necessity, and that the host, chrism, and holy oil be kept under lock and key, &c.

26. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and their officers to pass sentence without first giving the canonical monitions.

27. Forbids to exact any fee for burials and the administration of the holy sacraments.

30. Orders ecclesiastics to wear decent habits with close copes, to observe the tonsure, to keep their hair cut short, and to abstain from immoderate eating and drinking.

31. Forbids clergymen in holy orders publicly to keep concubines.

34. Forbids the clergy to spend their ecclesiastical revenues in building houses on lay fees for their sons, nephews, or concubines.

36. Forbids the nuns to wear veils of silk, to use pins of silver and gold, and to wear girdles worked and embroidered, and long trains.

41. Forbids to give to a person already provided with a benefice, having cure of souls, any revenue out of another church.

42 and 43. Order monks to live in common, and forbid them to receive any one into their community under eighteen years of age.

44. Orders monks to give away to the poor what remains of their repasts.

45. Forbids monks to make wills.

47. Forbids monks and canons regular to eat and drink save at the appointed hours, permits them to quench their thirst in the refectory, but not to indulge.

In the Oxford copy of these constitutions two others are added relating to the Jews.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 270. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 585.

Oxford, 1322. OXFORD. Held in 1322, by Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury, in which ten constitutions were published.

1. Relates to the conferring of holy orders. Directs that all candidates shall be examined previously; enumerates those cases in which holy orders shall be refused. Also forbids to admit clerks ordained in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, to officiate without letters dismissory or commendatory from their ordinaries. Orders that monks shall be ordained by their own diocesan.

2. Directs priests to exhort their people to be confirmed, and adults to confess before confirmation. Orders that children on the third day after confirmation be carried to church, that their foreheads may be washed in the baptistery by the priest's hand, in honour of the chrism. Prescribes caution against children receiving confirmation twice.

3. Relates to extreme unction, and appeals to S. James (v. 14, 15) in proof of its necessity.

4. Orders rectors and priests to be careful of their altars, to keep the holy Eucharist in a clean pyx of silver or ivory, or other befitting material, to renew the consecrated host weekly, to carry it to the sick with reverence, a light going before, &c.

5. Orders that the linen furniture of the altar be kept whole and clean, that the words of the canon be fully and exactly pronounced, and with the greatest devotion. Forbids a priest to celebrate mass till he has finished matins, prime, and undern. Directs that two candles, or one at least, be lighted at high mass.

6. Relates to the duty of archdeacons in visitation.

7. Relates to marriage.

8. Relates to penance. Orders the priest to consider carefully the particular circumstances of each sin, to receive confessions, especially those of women, in some open place, to consult the bishop, or some discreet men, in doubtful cases, and to be careful not

to make the penitents implicate other persons by name in their confessions.

9. Forbids a priest, in a state of mortal sin, to celebrate before confession. Forbids to reveal confession in any way, directly or indirectly; orders that a priest convicted of doing so, shall be degraded without hope of reconciliation.

10. Orders the appointment of a fit priest in every deanery to receive the confession of the clergy.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 512.

Oxford, 1408.

OXFORD. Held in 1408, by Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, against the Lollards. Ten constitutions were published at this council, and sanctioned in one held afterwards in London.

1. Forbids any one to preach without being first examined and allowed by the diocesan. Also forbids men suspended for preaching erroneous doctrine, to preach within the province until they be restored by the ordinary who suspended them. Sentences all violators of this statute to excommunication. Declares that any preacher who shall a second time, in any way, intimate that the Church has not power to make such ordinances by her prelates, shall be sentenced to excommunication; and all Christian people forbidden to hold any communication with him, under pain of excommunication. Further declares, that when lawfully convicted of so doing, such offenders shall be declared heretics by the ordinary, and incur all the penalties of heresy, and their aiders and abettors also, unless they desist within a month from the date of their admonition.

2. Forbids the clergy and people of any parish to allow any one to preach unless full assurance be first given of his being authorized, privileged, or sent according to the form specified in Constitution 1. Orders that the church, churchyard, or other place where unauthorized preachers have been permitted to hold forth, shall be put under an interdict. Orders further, that authorized preachers shall suit their discourses to the circumstances of their hearers.

3. Excommunicates, *ipso facto*, all who preach or say any thing contrary to the teaching of the Church concerning the sacraments, or any point of faith; declares that such offenders shall not be absolved (except at the point of death), unless they abjure their errors and do penance. Orders that persons who do so a

Oxford, 1408.

second time, shall be formally denounced as heretics, and subject to confiscation of their goods. With regard to the penance to be performed, it is declared that the offender shall expressly recant the things he has preached, taught, or affirmed, in the parish church in which he did so, upon some one or more Lord's-days or holy days, at high mass.

4. Forbids schoolmasters and other teachers to instruct their pupils in the sacraments and other theological points, contrary to the determination of the Church, and enjoins them not to permit their scholars to dispute publicly or privately upon such subjects.

5. Forbids to read any book composed by John Wiclif, or any other in his time or since, in any schools, halls, inns, or other places whatsoever within the province, unless it have been first examined and unanimously approved by the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge.

6. Declares, upon the authority of S. Jerome, that the translation of the text of holy Scripture is a dangerous thing, because it is not easy to make the sense in all respects the same; enacts that no one shall henceforth, by his own authority, translate any text of Scripture into English; and that no part of any such book or treatise lately composed in the time of John Wiclif, shall be read in public or private, under pain of excommunication.

7. Forbids any one, under pain of being publicly denounced excommunicate, to propose or assert any propositions which carry a sound contrary to the Catholic faith or good morals.

8. Forbids all disputing, either in public or private, concerning things determined by the Church, unless it be in order to get at the true meaning. Forbids, also, to call in question the authority of Church decisions, or to preach any thing contrary to them, especially concerning the adoration of the cross, the veneration of the images of the saints, and pilgrimages to holy places and relics, or against taking oaths in judicial matters. Orders all preachers to encourage these things, as well as processions, genuflexions, bowings, incensings, kissings, oblations, pilgrimages, illuminations, and the making of oaths in a lawful manner, by touching God's holy Gospels. Offenders to incur the penalty of heresy.

9. Orders that none be admitted to serve as chaplain

in any diocese within the province, who was not born or ordained there, or unless he bring with him letters from his diocesan.

10. Declares the University of Oxford to be infected with new unprofitable doctrines, and blemished with the new damnable brand of Lollardy, to the great scandal of the University at home and abroad, and to the seemingly irreparable injury of the Church of England, which used to be defended by her virtue and learning; that therefore, upon the petition of the proctors of the whole clergy of the province, and with the consent of all the prelates present in the convocation, it is enacted that every head of a college or hall in the University shall, at least once a month, make diligent inquiry whether any scholar or inhabitant hath asserted or held any proposition carrying a sound contrary to the Catholic faith and sound morals; and if he find any such, that he shall effectually admonish him. And that any such person so admonished advancing the same proposition, shall be *ipso facto* excommunicated and otherwise punished. Orders that if the offender be a scholar, he shall be disqualified for his degree; if a doctor, M. A., or B. A., he shall be suspended from all scholastic acts, lose all his rights in his college, and be actually expelled, and a Catholic put into his place. Declares that if any head of a house shall neglect, within ten days after the publication of those constitutions, to execute the above regulations against any offender in their college, he shall himself be *ipso facto* excommunicated and deprived of his office, and the college considered to be void, and a new head appointed. Enacts the same penalties against a head of a college suspected of heresy, who, after admonition from the ordinary, does not reform; and further, declares him to be for three years incapable of holding any benefice within the province. Lastly, it treats of the manner of proceeding against suspected persons.—*Johnson, Eccl. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2089. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 314.

P.

PADERBORN. [*Concilium Paderbornense.*] Held in 777, to confirm the newly-baptized Saxons in the faith. It was ordered that all should take an oath to Paderborn, 777.

abide for ever in the Christian faith; and they that refused to do so, were punished with the loss of all their property.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1823.

Padua, 1350. PADUA. [*Concilium Patavianum.*] Held in the spring of 1350, by cardinal Guy d'Auvergne, legate of pope Clement VI., for the reformation of morals and the good of the Church. Another council was held at the end of the year.—*Raynaldus*, A. D. 1350. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1918.

Palencia, 1388. PALENCIA. [*Concilium Palentinum.*] Held in 1388, by Pedro of Luna, legate of the antipope Clement VII., in Spain. The king (John I.), three archbishops, and twenty-five bishops, were present. Seven canons were published.

1. Directs bishops to watch over the conduct of their clergy.

2. Renews the constitution of Valladolid, in 1322, concerning incontinence in the clergy.

3. Directs that if the married clergy will enjoy the privileges of the clerical state, they shall observe the tonsure and the clerical dress. In order that no doubt might exist as to the form of the tonsure, a figure of it was appended to the canon.

5. and 6. Relate to the Jews and Saracens, and order that they shall be compelled to respect the Church festivals.

7. Is directed against adulterers and notorious fornicators.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2068.

Palestine, 196. or 198. PALESTINE. [*Concilium Palæstinum.*] Held at Jerusalem in 196 (or 198); fourteen bishops were present, at the head of whom were St. Narcissus of Jerusalem, and S. Theophilus of Cesarea. The subject before the council was the proper time for the celebration of Easter, which was much disputed in the Church; some held that the Lent fast ought to end, and the fast of the Resurrection be kept, on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week it might chance to be; and they supported their opinion by the authority of S. John and S. Philip, the Apostles, and of S. Polycarp, and other illustrious saints of Asia, who (they maintained) had observed this custom. The others, on the contrary, asserted that the festival of the Resurrection ought to be kept, and therefore the Lent fast ought to end on Sunday, and they supported their opinion by the tradition received in the Church from SS. Peter and Paul. The

decision of this council was in favour of the latter practice.—*Eusebius*, l. v. c. 22.

In the council of Asia, held at Ephesus in the same year (196), under Polycrates the bishop, a contrary decision was arrived at, and Polycrates wrote to Victor, bishop of Rome, declaring that the practice of his Church being founded upon the example of SS. John and Philip, and other saints, he could not consent to alter it. Upon this, Victor, with more zeal for his cause than Christian charity, threatened to separate the Asiatic Churches from his communion, a step which greatly displeased many even of those who thought with him upon the question; and Irenæus, amongst many others, wrote to him, and in the name of the Gallic bishops exhorted him to preserve unity and charity in the Church. Both parties then continued in the practice which they had received from their predecessors until the first œcumenical council at Nicea, in 325, in which the question was definitively settled in favour of the Latin mode.—*Eus.* l. v. c. 23. Tom. i. Conc. pp. 596 and 600.

PARIS. [*Concilium Luteciense*, or *Parisiense.*] Held in 360 according to the most common opinion, under Julian the Apostate, who was proclaimed Augustus in Paris, in May, 360. S. Hilary had lately arrived in Gaul from Constantinople, and at his entreaty the heretical formulary of Ariminum (A. D. 359) was rejected. Amongst the fragments which remain to us of S. Hilary we have a synodical letter from the bishops of this council to those of the East, in which they return thanks to God for having delivered them from the Arian heresy, and for having enabled them to learn the real sentiments of the orientals. They then give an open profession and clear exposition of the doctrine of consubstantiality; they retract all that they had, through ignorance, done at Ariminum, and promised to perform whatever the orientals required of them, to the extent of deposing and excommunicating all in Gaul who should resist. Paris, 360.

Further, the bishops declared that those who had consented to suppress the word "ousia," or substance, both at Ariminum and at Nice in Thrace, had been chiefly induced to do so by the false statement made by the Arian party, that the confession of faith which they were called upon to sign had had the sanction of the

oriental bishops, who, as they said, had been the first to introduce the use of this word in the controversy with the Arians: "And we," they added, "received it, and have always preserved the use of it inviolably; we have used this word ὁμοούσιος to express the true and actual generation of the only Son of God. When we say that He is of one and the same *substance*, it is only to exclude the idea of creation, adoption, &c. We recognize no likeness worthy of Him but that of true God to true God. . . . . We revoke all that we have done ill through ignorance and simplicity, and we excommunicate Auxentius, Ursaces, and Valens, Gajus Megasius and Justin."

About this time several other councils were held in Gaul, by means of S. Hilary, upon the same subject.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 821. *Baronius*, 302, § 229, and *Pagi*, note 27.

Paris, 557. PARIS. Held in 557, under king Childebert; the archbishops of Bourges, Rouen, and Bordeaux were present. Ten canons were published.

1. Against those who detain Church property.

4. Against marriages within the degrees prohibited; forbids to marry a brother's widow or wife's sister.

8. Enacts that the election of the bishop shall be left free to the people and clergy; that no one shall be intruded into a see by the prince, or contrary to the will of the metropolitan and the provincial bishops.

These canons are subscribed by fifteen bishops, amongst whom were S. Pretextatus of Rouen, Leo of Bordeaux, Germanus of Paris, and Euphronius of Tours [5].—Tom. v. Conc. p. 814.

Paris, 573. PARIS. Held in 573, by thirty-two bishops (six of whom were metropolitans), in order to terminate a difference between Chilperic and Sigebert, the two brothers of the king Gontram. Promotus, who had been uncanonically consecrated bishop of Châteaudun, by Ogidius of Rheims, was deposed, but was not removed, apparently, until the death of Sigebert.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 918.

Paris, 577. PARIS. Held in the spring of 577, by Chilperic; forty-five bishops were present, who deposed Pretextus, bishop of Rouen, upon a false accusation of having

[5] Eleven of the subscriptions are after this form:—"Germanus peccator Episc. consensi et subscripsi."

favoured the revolt of Merovee, the king's son, and plotted his death[6]. S. Gregory of Tours refused his consent to the act. Pretextatus was banished and Melanius put into his place.—Tom. v. Conc. 925.

PARIS. Held in 615, under king Clotaire II. This was the most numerously attended of the Gallic councils up to this period. Seventy-nine bishops from all the newly united provinces of Gaul were present. Fifteen canons have been preserved, but others probably were published. Paris, 615.

1. Declares elections of bishops made without consent of the metropolitan, and the bishops of the province, and of the clergy, and people of the city, or made by violence, cabal, or bribery, to be null and void.

2. Forbids bishops to appoint their own successors; forbids to appoint another to the see during the life-time of the actual bishop, except the latter be incapable of managing his Church.

4. Declares that no secular judge may try or condemn any priest, deacon, or other ecclesiastic, without first giving warning to the bishop.

14. Forbids marriage with a brother's widow, and other incestuous marriages.

15. Forbids a Jew to exercise any public office over Christians, and in case of his obtaining such an office, contrary to canon, insists upon his being baptized with all his family.

Most of the other canons refer to the property of the Church and of ecclesiastics.

King Clotaire published an edict for the execution of these canons, with some modification however, since he commanded that the bishop elected according to canon 1, should not be consecrated without the leave of the prince.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1649.

PARIS. Held in November, 825. The bishops present addressed a synodal letter to the emperors Louis and Lothaire, in which they declare their approval of the letter of Hadrian to the emperor Constantine and Paris, 825.

[6] Although Pretextatus was innocent of the charge of conspiracy against the king in favour of Merovee (or Merovig), who was his grandson, he had been guilty of marrying the latter to Brunchilde, the widow of his uncle, which was also alleged against him. Sigebert appears to have used intimidation to induce the bishops to condemn Pretextatus. The place of his banishment was probably Jersey.

his mother Irene, so far as relates to his rebuke for their audacity and rashness in removing and breaking the images, but his command to adore them *(eas adorare)* they refuse to approve, styling all such adoration superstitious and sinful; they also declare, that in their opinion the testimonies which he had collected from the holy fathers in support of his view, and had inserted in his letter, were very little to the purpose. They further declare, that without approving the acts of the council of Constantinople in 754, they condemn the second council of Nicea, and hold that it was no light error on the part of those who composed it, to assert not only that images should be venerated and adored *(coli et adorari)*, and called by the title of holy, but that even some degree of holiness was to be attained through their means *(verum etiam sanctimoniam ab eis se adipisci professi sunt)*.

They declared their adhesion to the Caroline books. —*Goldast in Dec. Imp. de Imag.* Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1542.

Paris, 829. PARIS. Held June 6th, 829, under Louis le Débonnaire, composed of the four provinces of Rheims, Sens, Tours, and Rouen; twenty-five bishops attended, besides the four metropolitans of the above-mentioned provinces. The council was held in the church of S. Stephen the elder. The acts of the council are divided into three Books of Canons.

Book I. relates to ecclesiastical discipline.

Canon 7. Forbids to baptize except at the canonical times, without necessity.

8. Directs that persons baptized in illness, beyond the proper canonical times for baptism, shall not be admitted to holy orders, according to the twelfth canon of Neocesarea.

16. Declares that all property amassed by bishops and priests after their ordination, shall be considered as belonging to their Churches, and that their heirs shall have no part of it.

18. Declares that the pastors of the Church ought to possess the property of the Church without being *possessed by it*, and that in the possession of it they ought to despise it. It condemns also those worldly people who are ever complaining that the Church is too rich.

26. Orders that one or two provincial councils shall be held annually.

27. Is intended as a check upon the Chorepiscopi,

forbids them to confirm and to perform any other function peculiar to the episcopate.

44. Forbids women to take the veil until thirty days after their husbands' death, at which time they were by the emperor's edict free to marry again.

45. Forbids women to touch the sacred vessels, or to give the vestments to the priests; also forbids them to give the *holy eucharist* to the people: an abuse which it seems had crept in, in some places.

47. Forbids to say mass in private houses, or in gardens and chapels, except when on travel, and in extreme cases when people are very far from a church.

48. Forbids priests to say mass alone.

50. Insists upon the proper observation of Sunday, and directs that a humble supplication should be addressed to the prince, entreating him to stop all pleadings and markets on that day, and to forbid all work.

The second book relates to the duties of princes and lay persons.

Canon 10. Condemns the error of those persons who think, that having been baptized, they must eventually be saved, whatever sins they may commit.

The third book contains a collection of twenty-seven of the foregoing canons, which the bishops forwarded to the emperors Louis and Lothaire, specially requesting the execution of some of the number.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1590.

PARIS[7]. Held in the autumn of the year 849, composed of twenty-two bishops from the provinces of Tours, Sens, Rheims, and Rouen, who addressed a letter to Nomenoi, the duke of Bretagne, concerning his proceedings in the council of Rennes in the preceding year, on which occasion he had taken for his own use the property of the Church, which, they stated, was the patrimony of the poor. He had driven the lawful occupiers from their sees, and had put mercenaries and thieves in their places; and he had favoured the revolt of Lambert, count of Nantes, against king Charles.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 58. Paris, 849.

PARIS. Held on the 16th October, 1050, in the presence of king Henry I. Many bishops attended. Paris, 1050.

[7] Styled by some the synod of Tours.

A letter from Beranger was read, which gave great offence to the council, and he was condemned, together with his accomplices. Also a book by John Scotus upon the Eucharist, whence the errors which they had condemned were taken. The council declared that if Beranger and his followers would not retract, the whole army of France, with the clergy at their head in their ecclesiastical vestments, should march to find them, wherever they might be, and should besiege them, until they would submit to the Catholic faith, or should be taken in order to be put to death. See C. Verceil, 1050.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1059.

Paris, 1147. PARIS. Held some time after Easter, 1147, by pope Eugene III., assisted by many cardinals and learned men. The errors of Gilbert de Poirée, bishop of Poitiers, upon the subject of the blessed Trinity, were examined; two doctors, Adam of Petit Pont and Hugo of Champfleuri, attacking him vigorously. He was accused chiefly on the four following grounds:—

1. Quod videlicet assereret Divinam Essentiam non esse Deum.

2. Quod proprietates personarum non essent ipsæ personæ.

3, Quod theologicæ personæ in nulla prædicarentur propositione.

4. Quod Divina Natura non esset incarnata [8].

S. Bernard, who was present, disputed with Gilbert; but the pope, in default of certain evidence, deferred the decision of the question to a council to be held in the year following. See C. of Rheims, 1148.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1105 and 1121.

Paris, 1186. PARIS. Held in 1186. An assembly of all the French archbishops, bishops, and chief seigneurs, whom the king, Philip Augustus, desired to exhort his subjects to make the voyage to Jerusalem in defence of the Catholic faith.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1747.

Another, 1188. In another council, held three years afterwards by the same king, the payment of the Saladine tenth was

[8] 1. That the Divine Essence was not God.

2. That the properties of the Divine Persons were not the Persons themselves.

3. That the Divine Persons are not an attribute, in any sense.

4. That the Divine Nature was not incarnate.

ordered, *i. e.* the tenth of every one's revenue and goods for the succour of the Holy Land.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1763.

PARIS. Held in 1201, by Octavian, the pope's legate, assisted by several bishops. Evraud of Nevers, the governor of the district, said to have been one of the Vaudois, was convicted of heresy; and having been carried to Nevers, was there burnt.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 24. Paris, 1201.

PARIS. Held in 1210, in which the errors of Amauri [9], lately dead, were condemned, and fourteen of his followers sentenced to be burnt. Also Aristotle's Metaphysics, which had been brought to Paris, and translated into Latin, shared the same fate; and a decree was published, forbidding the book to be transcribed, read, or kept, under pain of excommunication. —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 49. Paris, 1210.

PARIS. Held in 1213, by Robert de Courçon, cardinal and legate, whom the pope had sent into France to preach the crusade. Several canons of discipline were published, which are divided into four parts. Paris, 1213.

Part 1 refers to the secular clergy, and contains twenty canons.

1. Enjoins modesty of deportment, that the hair be kept cut short; forbids talking in church.

9. Forbids to employ a priest to say mass who is unknown, except he have letters from his own bishop.

13. Forbids the division of benefices and prebends.

14. Forbids the temporary or permanent appointment of rural-deans, in consideration of money received.

19. Forbids to possess more than one benefice with cure of souls.

Part 2 relates to the regulars, and contains twenty-seven canons.

1. Forbids to take money from any one entering upon the monastic state. Forbids monks to possess property.

[9] Amauri, a clerk belonging to the country near Chartres, a man well skilled in logic, who, having turned his attention to theology, had advanced, amongst other novelties, the doctrine, that every man must believe himself to be a member of Christ as firmly as he believes in the birth and passion of our Lord; and that without such faith he cannot be saved. After his death his followers added more dangerous errors, denying the use of the holy sacraments; asserting that charity makes a bad action no longer sinful, &c.

Paris, 1213. 2. Forbids to receive any one into the religious life under eighteen years of age.

3. Enjoins bishops to cause the suspicious little doors found in abbeys or priories, to be blocked up.

4 and 5. Exhort to charity and hospitality towards the poor.

9. Forbids monks to wear white leather gloves, fine shoes and stockings, &c., like those used by the laity, to use any other cloth save white or black, and to dine out of the refectory.

Part 3 relates to nuns, &c., also to abbots, abbesses, &c., and contains twenty-one canons.

3. Forbids nuns to leave their convent in order to visit their relations, except for a very short time; and directs that then they shall have an attendant with them.

4. Forbids them to dance in the cloisters, or any where else; and declares that it is better to dig or plough on Sunday than to dance.

8. Directs that abbesses who fail in their duty, shall be suspended; and, if they do not amend, shall be deposed.

9. Directs that abbots, priors, and other superiors who offend in the same manner, shall be punished.

11. Directs that they who lead an irregular life shall be deposed.

17. Forbids abbots and priors to threaten or maltreat any who may propose a measure to the chapter for the reformation of the house or of its head.

Part 4 relates to the duty of bishops and archbishops.

1. Directs them to keep their hair cut round, so as never to project beyond the mitre; and gives other directions for their proper conversation.

2. Forbids them to hear matins in bed, and to occupy themselves with worldly business and conversation whilst the holy office is being said.

4. Forbids them to hunt, &c., to wear precious furs, and to play with dice.

5. Directs that they shall cause some good book to be read at the beginning and end of their repasts.

6. Enjoins hospitality and charity.

15. Forbids them to permit duels, or hold courts of justice in cemeteries or holy places.

16. Enjoins the abolition of the Festival of Fools, celebrated every 1st of January.

17. Directs that a synod be held every year. Orders also confirmation, and the correction of disorders in the dioceses.

18. Directs that they shall not permit women to dance in cemeteries or in holy places, nor work to be done on Sundays.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 57.

PARIS. Held January 28, 1226, by a legate from the Roman see, upon the affairs of England and of the Albigenses. In consequence of the decision, Louis VIII. ceased from his pretensions against England, and turned his arms against the Albigenses. The legate, in the pope's name, excommunicated Raymond, count of Toulouse, with his accomplices, and confirmed to the king and his heirs for ever the right to the lands of the said count, as being a condemned heretic. Amauri, count de Montfort, and Guy, his uncle, ceded to the king whatever rights they possessed over the lands in question.—*Raynald*, Tom. i. p. 554 (note). Tom. xi. Conc. p. 300. Paris, 1226.

On the 20th of March, same year, the king, Lewis VIII., convoked another council upon the subject of the Albigenses.

PARIS. Held in 1255, by Henry, archbishop of Sens, and five other archbishops, on occasion of the murder of a chanter of the cathedral church of Chartres. In this council the head of the order of preaching friars complained of certain things said and preached by some seculars, doctors in theology, to the prejudice of his order. William de S. Amour and Laurent, both doctors-regent in theology at Paris, being examined upon the subject by the prelates, denied the justice of the charge. Subsequently S. Amour wrote a book, entitled "The Perils of the Last Days," in which he vigorously attacked the preaching friars without mercy. At last the dispute between the latter and the university of Paris became so warm, that S. Louis was obliged to send to Rome to appease it. The pope, however, sided entirely with the friars.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 738. Paris, 1255.

PARIS. Held on the 21st March, 1260, by order of S. Louis, to implore the aid of heaven against the conquests of the Tartars. It was ordered that processions should be made, blasphemy punished, luxury in dress and at table repressed, tournaments prohibited for two years, and all sports whatever put a stop to, except practice with the bow and cross-bow. In the Paris, 1260.

following year, in another council, all these acts were renewed.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 793.

Paris, 1281. PARIS. Held in December, 1281, composed of four archbishops and twenty bishops. Much complaint was made of the conduct of the mendicant order, who persisted in preaching and hearing confession in spite of the bishops, upon pretext of having the pope's privilege for doing so. A bull by Martin IV., bearing date January 10, 1280, was, however, produced, which confirmed the claim of the Franciscan friars; but, nevertheless, with this clause, that those persons who chose to confess to the friars, should be bound to confess also once a year, at the least, to their own priest, according to the order of the council of Lateran; and that the friars should sedulously exhort them to do so.—*Doboulay*, Tom. iii. p. 465.

Paris, 1302. PARIS. Held in 1302, April 10, upon occasion of the difference between the king, Philip the Fair, and the pope, Bonifacius VIII. The former in the preceding year, had thrown into prison Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers; upon which the pope wrote to Philip, complaining of the act, accompanying the letter with the bull "Ausculta Fili," in which he plainly bids him not deceive himself by thinking that he had no superior, and that he was independent of the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Philip assembled his barons with the prelates at Notre Dame, and laid before them his ground of complaint against the pope and his bull, which he caused to be read. Whereupon the barons addressed a letter to the cardinals, in which, in very strong language, they complained of the pope's conduct in pretending to consider the king as his subject, and that he held his temporal authority of him. The prelates were more backward in delivering their opinion, and endeavoured to excuse the pope, and to maintain peace. This, however, was not suffered, and they were clearly informed, that if any one of them presumed to hold a contrary opinion to that of Philip and the lords, he would be looked upon as the enemy of the sovereign and kingdom. They then addressed to the pope a letter conceived in a much milder strain than that of the barons, in which they implored him to be cautious, and to preserve the ancient union between the Church and State; and, moreover, to revoke the mandamus, by which he had cited them to appear at Rome.

The answer of the cardinals to the barons was to the effect, that the pope had not absolutely declared that the king ought to acknowledge that he held the temporality of him, a statement which the pope himself in his answer to the bishops by no means corroborates.

This was not strictly speaking an ecclesiastical council, but a national assembly; two others of the same kind were held in the following year, upon the subject of the differences between the king and the pope. In September, in that year, the latter drew up a bull excommunicating Philip, but on the eve of the very day on which he had intended to publish it, he was seized by William de Nogaret, the French general, and though released from confinement almost immediately, he never recovered the mortification and sorrow which this blow inflicted on him, and on the 11th of October, 1303, he died at Rome.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1474.

PARIS. Held in 1310, by Philip de Marigni, archbishop of Sens, to deliberate upon the case of the Templars; after mature consideration, it was decided that some should be merely discharged from their engagement to the order, that others should be sent freely away, after having accomplished the course of penance prescribed; that others should be strictly shut up in prison, many being confined for life; and lastly, that some, as, for instance, the relapsed, should be given over to the secular arm, after having been degraded by the bishop if in holy orders. All this was accordingly done, and fifty Templars were burnt in the fields near the abbey of S. Antony, not one of whom confessed the crimes imputed to them, but on the contrary to the last they maintained the injustice of their sentence. [See C. of Senlis.] *Baluze.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1335. Paris, 1310.

PARIS. Held in 1323, March 3rd, by William de Melum, archbishop of Sens. A statute of four articles or canons was published, which was almost word for word identical with that drawn up in the council of Sens, A.D. 1320, under the same prelate. Paris, 1323.

Canon 1. Directs that the people shall fast on the eve of the holy sacrament.

2. Directs that an interdict shall be laid upon any place in which a clerk is detained by a secular judge.

4. Of the life, conversation, and dress of clerks.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1711.

PARIS. Held in 1346, March 6th, by the same Paris, 1346.

archbishop, assisted by five bishops. Thirteen canons were published.

1. Complains of the treatment of the clergy by the secular judges, and sets forth that the former were continually imprisoned, put to the torture, and even to death.

10. Directs that beneficed clerks shall employ a part of their revenue in keeping in order and repairing their church and parsonage.

13. Confirms the bull of John XXII, given May 7th, 1327, by which the indulgence of the Angelus is given to those who repeat it three times at night—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1908.

Paris, 1395. PARIS. A national council was held at Paris in 1395, at which the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem were present, together with seven archbishops, forty-six bishops, and a large number of abbots, deans, and doctors in theology.

The object of the council, convoked by Charles VI., was to consider about the best method of putting an end to the schism caused by the rival popes Benedict XIII. and Clement VII. The patriarch of Alexandria, Simon Cramandus, was unanimously elected to preside. The conclusion arrived at (February 2) by the majority, was that the best means of securing the peace of the Church would be for both claimants to resign their pretensions. The king's uncles, dukes of Berri and Burgundy, were in consequence sent as ambassadors to Rome, to Benedict.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2511, Appen.

Paris, 1398. PARIS. Another national council was held May 22nd, 1398; convoked by the same prince. There were present, besides Simon Cramand, the Latin patriarch of Alexandria, eleven archbishops, sixty bishops, and an immense number of abbots, deputies of universities, and others of the clergy. Simon Cramand opened the council.

In the second session, held in July, it was agreed that the best way of bringing Benedict to reason, was to deprive him not only of the power of collating to benefices, but of the entire exercise of his authority. For this purpose the king published, on the 27th of July, his letters patent, entirely suspending the pope's authority in the kingdom: this edict was published at Avignon, where Benedict then was, in September. This suspension lasted until May 30th, 1403, when the king revoked

it, and promised, in his own name and that of his realm, true obedience to Benedict XIII.—*Spicil.* tom. vi. p. 157.

PARIS. A national council, composed of clergy from all parts of France, was held in 1406, to take measures for terminating the schism. The council resolved to demand the convocation of a general council, and to withdraw from the obedience of Benedict XIII. The withdrawal was carried into effect on the 7th of August, and the pope was forbidden to take any money out of the country. In the following session, held at S. Martin's, certain theologians and canonists discussed the question, some speaking in favour of Benedict, and others against him; and in the last session, December 20th, the king's advocate declared his adhesion to the demand of the University for a general council, and an entire withdrawal from the obedience of Benedict; upon a division both these points were carried. Paris, 1406.

After this, both Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. severally promised to renounce the pontificate for the sake of peace, neither of them, however, really purposing to do so; and in 1408, Gregory having created four cardinals, in spite of the opposition of those then existing; the latter withdrew from his obedience, appealing to a general council, and to his successor. In answer to this appeal, Benedict published a bull, excommunicating all persons whatsoever, even kings and princes, who refused to resort to conference as the means of restoring peace to the Church, &c. &c. This bull was condemned at Paris, and torn up as inimical to the king's majesty. Pedro of Luna was declared to be schismatical, obstinate, and heretical, and every person forbidden to style him any longer either Benedict, pope, or cardinal, or to obey him, &c.

PARIS. A national council was held in 1408, convoked to deliberate upon the government of the Church, and the presentations to benefices: First, The declaration of the favourers and adherents of Pedro of Luna was read; then a great number of articles were drawn up, upon the manner in which the French Church should be governed during the neutrality. These articles come under five principal heads. Paris, 1408.

1. Concerning the absolution of sins and censures reserved ordinarily for the pope; for these the council

permits that recourse be had to the penitentiary of the holy see [7] or, if that cannot be, to the ordinary.

2. Concerning dispensations for irregularities, and for marriage. In these cases recourse was to be had to provincial councils.

3. Concerning the administration of justice, for which purpose it was ordered that the archbishops should hold a council yearly with their suffragans; the monks to do the same.

4. As to appeals, the last court of appeal was declared to be a provincial council.

5. As to presentations to benefices, it was ruled that the election of prelates should be made freely and according to right rule; that the elections of bishops should be confirmed by the metropolitan, and those of archbishops by the primate, or by the provincial council. In fact, the provincial council was made the substitute in all those matters which were usually carried to the pope.

It was further resolved, that the revenue of all benefices enjoyed by the followers of Pedro of Luna, should be seized and put into the king's hands.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2518.

Paris, or Sens, 1429.

PARIS (or SENS.) Held in 1429, from the 1st of March to the 23rd of April, by John de Nanton, archbishop of Sens, assisted by the bishops of Chartres, Paris, Meaux, and Troyes, his suffragans, together with the proctors of the bishops of Auxerre and Nevers, and a great number of abbots and other ecclesiastics. Forty regulations, relating to the duties and conduct of ecclesiastics, monks, and regular canons, the celebration of marriage, and the dispensation of banns, were drawn up. The following are the most remarkable.

1. Orders canons and other clerks connected with the churches to celebrate Divine service in an edifying manner, to chant the Psalms reverently, pausing between the verses, so that one side of the choir should not begin before the other had finished.

4. Exhorts the clergy to act as models of piety and correct behaviour to the laity; not to be careless in doing their duties, and not to accept of any benefice merely for the sake of the income to be derived from it.

[1] The president of the penitential court at Rome, an office said to have been established by Benedict II. in 684.

8. Excludes from entering the Church for three months, bishops who raise to the priesthood persons of irregular life and ignorant of the epistles, gospels, and other parts of the holy office.

Other regulations refer to the conduct of curates, and direct them to exhort their parishioners to confession five times a year, viz. at Easter, Whitsuntide, the Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas, and also at the beginning of the New Year; others relate to the conduct of abbots, abbesses, priors of the orders of S. Benedict and S. Augustine, prescribing annual chapters, modesty of apparel and gesture, &c.; and forbids money to be exacted from any one entering upon a monastic life.

Regulation 25. Forbids barbers, and other persons in trade, and merchants, to exercise their calling on Sundays and festivals.

32 and 33. Forbid the celebration of marriages out of the parish church, and too great laxity in dispensations of banns.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 392.

Paris, 1528, sometimes called Council of Sens.

PARIS. Held in 1528, from the 3rd of February to the 9th of October, in the church of the Great Augustines. Cardinal Antoine du Prat, archbishop of Sens, and chancellor of France, presiding, assisted by seven bishops, viz. the bishops of Chartres, Auxerre, Meaux, Paris, Orleans, Nevers, and Troyes.

The objects of the council were chiefly to condemn the errors of Luther, and to reform the discipline of the Church. Sixteen decrees were published relating to the faith, and forty upon discipline.

Amongst the first the following are the principal:—

1. Declares that the Church Catholic is one, and cannot err.

2. That it is *visible*.

3. That the Church is represented by an œcumenical council, which has universal authority in determining questions of faith, &c.

4. That to the Church it belongs to determine the authenticity of the canonical books, and to settle the sense of Holy Scripture.

5. That the apostolical traditions are certain and necessary, and to be firmly believed.

6. That the constitutions and customs of the Church are to be submitted to with respect, and her rule of conduct to be obeyed.

Paris, 1528. 7. That seasons of fasting and abstinence are to be observed under pain of anathema.

8. That the celibacy of the clergy being ordered by the Latin Church, having been always practised and enjoined by the second council of Carthage, as a law ordained in the apostolical times; they who teach the contrary are to be treated as heretics.

9. That monastic vows are not at variance with Christian liberty, and are to be kept.

10. That they who take from the number of sacraments, and who deny their efficacy to confer grace, are to be treated as heretics. This decree treats of each sacrament in detail.

11. That the necessity of the sacrifice of the mass is supported by several passages of Holy Scripture, especially by S. Luke xxii. That this holocaust, this victim for sin, this continual sacrifice, is the "pure offering" of which the prophet Malachi speaks.

12. After refuting the opinions of Luther upon the subjects of purgatory and of prayer for the dead, this decree goes on to state that, after baptism, the guilt of sin being remitted, there still remains the temporal penalty to be paid, so that sinners may yet be compelled to expiate their faults in the other world, and that it is a salutary custom to offer the holy sacrifice for the dead.

13. Concerning the worship of saints, they declare it to be firmly established in the Church, that the saints hear our prayers, that they are alive to our sorrows, and feel joy in seeing us happy; and that Holy Scripture proves this.

14. Declares that it is not idolatry to venerate images; that the intention is to honour them whom they represent, and remind us of, and to make us imitate their holy actions.

15. That man's free-will does not exclude grace; that the latter is not irresistible; that God does predestinate us and choose us, but that He will glorify those only who make their calling and election sure by good works.

16. That faith in no wise excludes works, especially those of charity: and that men are not justified by faith only.

Then follows a list containing thirty-nine errors maintained by the heretics of the time.

Of the forty decrees on discipline the following may be noticed.

3—9. Relate to persons to be admitted to holy orders or to any benefices, and enact that they who are admitted to holy orders without being properly qualified, are to be suspended until they are sufficiently instructed.

By canon 11 curates are compelled to residence, and to instruct their parishioners.

In 16 care is directed to be taken with the psalmody, and all profane tunes upon church-organs were to be scrupulously avoided.

33. Forbids printing the Holy Scriptures and works of the fathers without the consent of the diocesan.

34. Orders all persons to bring all books in their possession relating to faith or morals, to their bishop for examination.

36. Of proper persons to be licensed to preach.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 432.

PARIS. Held March 13, in 1612. Cardinal du Peron, archbishop of Sens, presiding. The book of Edmund Ricker, concerning the ecclesiastical power, was condemned.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1628. Paris, 1612.

PAVIA. [*Concilium Papiense* or *Ticinense.*] Held in December, 850, by order of the emperor Louis, who attended; Angelbert of Milan presiding. This does not appear to have been strictly an ecclesiastical council. A capitular relating to secular matters was drawn up, and twenty-five canons of ecclesiastical discipline. Pavia, 850.

1. Directs that bishops shall keep about them priests and deacons of known probity to be witnesses of their secret acts.

2. Directs that bishops shall celebrate mass not only on Sundays and holy days, but when possible, every day; and that they shall not neglect privately to offer prayers for themselves, their fellow bishops, kings, all the rulers of God's Church, and for all those who have desired their prayers, but especially for the poor.

3. Orders them to exercise frugality at table, to receive pilgrims and poor and sick people, and to exhort them and read to them.

4 and 5. Direct that they shall not hunt, hawk, &c., nor mix in worldly pleasures; bids them read the Holy Scriptures, explain them to their clergy, and preach on Sundays and holy days.

7. Directs that priests shall examine whether penitents really perform their acts of penance, give alms largely, &c.; public offenders to be reconciled by the bishop only.

9. Warns all fathers of families to marry their daughters as soon as they are of age, lest they fall into sin; and forbids the marriage blessing to those who marry after fornication.

14. Orders bishops immediately to re-establish those monasteries in their dioceses which have gone to decay through their negligence.

18. Declares that priests and deacons (acephali), who are under no episcopal jurisdiction, are not to be looked upon as belonging to the clergy.

21. Forbids usury.

22. Enjoins bishops to watch over those who have the care of orphans, and to see that they do not injure or oppress them. If such oppressors refuse to listen to their remonstrances, they are ordered to call the emperor's attention to the case.

23. Orders bishops to arrest clerks and monks who wander about the country, agitating useless questions, and sowing the seeds of error, and to bring them before the metropolitan.

25. Condemns to a very severe course of penance those who deal in magical arts, who pretend to cause love or hatred by their incantations, and who are suspected of having caused the death of others; enjoins that they shall not be reconciled except on their death bed.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 61.

Pavia, 876. PAVIA. Held in 876, by Charles the Bald (crowned emperor by John VIII. December 15, 875). Seventeen bishops from Tuscany and Lombardy attended. The archbishop of Milan presiding [2]. Fifteen canons were published.

1. Orders respect and veneration everywhere for the holy Roman Church, as the head of all Churches.

2 and 3. Also relate to the respect, &c., due to the Roman see and to the pope John.

4. Orders respect for the priesthood.

[2] In this council an ancient document was produced, said to have been given to the archbishop of Milan by Gregory the Great, or Charlemagne, by which they claimed to themselves the right of electing the king of Italy fourteen days after the death of the last possessor.—*Muratori, Rer. Ital.* tom. ii. part ii. col. 148.

5. Orders respect for the imperial dignity.

The three following relate to the duties of bishops.

The acts of this council were confirmed in that of Pontyon, held in the same year. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 279.

PAVIA. Held in 1022, August 1. Benedict VIII. in this council complained of the licentious life of the clergy, and showed that it dishonoured the Church; he declared that they consumed the wealth given to them by the liberality of princes, in keeping women and providing for their children. A decree in seven articles was published for the reformation of the clergy, which the emperor confirmed, adding temporal penalties against the refractory.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 819. Pavia, 1022.

PAVIA. Held in 1160, in which the anti-pope, Victor III. (Octavianus), was acknowledged as pope instead of Alexander III., by the emperor, Frederick I. —Tom. x. Conc. p. 1387. Pavia, 1160.

PAVIA. Held in 1423. This council was convoked at the council of Constance, and was opened in the month of May; some deputies from England, France, and Germany, being present. But on the 22nd of June it was transferred to Sienna, on account of the plague, which threatened Pavia.—Tom. xii. Conc. 365. Pavia, 1423.

PENNAFIEL. [*Concilium Penafelense.*] Held April 1, 1302, by Gonsalvo of Toledo and his suffragans. Fifteen articles were published, tending to repress those abuses which are noticed in the councils of this age, viz. incontinence amongst the clergy, usury, &c. Amongst other things, it was enacted, by canon 12, that in every church the "Salve Regina" should be sung after compline. By canon 8, that the priests should make with their own hands the bread to be consecrated at the Eucharist; or cause it to be made by other ecclesiastics in their own presence. By canon 7, that tithe should be paid of all lawful property, thereby to recognize the universal sovereignty of God. —Tom. xi. Conc. Append. p. 2444. Pennafiel, 1302.

PERTH. [*Concilium Perthusanum.*] Held in 1202 or 1203, by cardinal John Salerno, Roman legate in Scotland; in which certain regulations relating to the reform of the clergy were drawn up. The council lasted three days, but two only of the canons are known. Perth, 1202.

1. That they who had received orders on Sunday, should be removed from the service of the altar.

2. That every Saturday from twelve o'clock be kept as a day of rest, by abstaining from work; the holy day to continue till Monday morning.—*Bp. Skinner*, vol. i. p. 280. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 24.

Perth, 1212. PERTH. Held in 1212. William Malvoisin, bishop of S. Andrew's, Walter, bishop of Glasgow, and others were present. The pope's instructions for preaching the Crusade were published; upon which, says the author of the Scotichronicon, great numbers of all ranks of clergy throughout Scotland, regulars as well as seculars, took the cross, but very few of the rich or great men of the kingdom.—*Bp. Skinner*, vol. i. p. 280. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 532.

Philadelphia, 1789. PHILADELPHIA. A general convention of the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church in America was held in August, and adjourned to October 2, 1789, in which the constitution of the American Church, formed in 1786, was reviewed and settled in nine articles.

Article 1. Provides for a triennial general convention on the first Wednesday in October; and orders that no business shall commence until the Church, in the majority of dioceses which shall have adopted this constitution, shall be duly represented.

Article 2. Enacts that the Church in each diocese shall be entitled to be represented by one or more deputies (not exceeding four for the clergy and four for the laity), to be chosen by the convention of the diocese; the concurrence of both orders to be necessary to constitute a vote of the convention. All dioceses having adopted this constitution to be considered bound by the acts of the general convention, even though they neglect to send representatives.

Article 3. Directs that whenever general conventions are held, the bishops, when there shall be three or more present, shall form a separate house, which shall have a negative upon acts passed in the house of deputies. When there are fewer than three bishops present, those who are present shall be *ex-officio* members of the convention, and shall vote with the clerical deputies, and a bishop shall then preside.

Article 4. Provides that the bishop in every diocese shall be chosen according to the rules fixed by the

convention of that diocese. Forbids any bishop to interfere in the diocese of another. Philadelphia, 1789.

Article 5. Provides for the future admission of other churches within the territory of the United States, and for the formation of new dioceses from one or more existing dioceses, under the following restrictions :—

1. No existing diocese to be infringed upon without the consent of the bishops and convention of that diocese, and that of the general convention.

2. Every such new diocese to contain at least eight thousand square miles and thirty presbyters.

3. Where the new diocese is formed by the division of an existing diocese into two, the actual bishop of the existing diocese to choose which of the two bishoprics he will take.

Article 6. Provides that the mode of trying bishops shall be settled by the general convention ; the court appointed for that purpose shall be composed of bishops only. And that the mode of trying priests and deacons shall be settled by the diocesan convention. Enacts that the bishop alone shall pronounce sentence of admonition, suspension, or degradation.

Article 7. Orders that persons to be admitted to holy orders shall have been examined by the bishop and two presbyters, and shall subscribe the following declaration :—

"I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation : and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States."

Forbids to admit any person ordained by a foreign bishop, to minister in any church until he have subscribed the above, and complied with the proper canons.

Article 8. Enacts that a Book of Common Prayer, to be hereafter established, shall be used in all the dioceses adopting this constitution ; and that no alteration or addition shall be made therein, unless proposed in one general convention, and adopted by another subsequently.

Article 9. Provides for future alterations in the constitution.

In this convention the Book of Common Prayer now in use in the American Church was prepared ; some parts of it were drawn up by the lower house, and some

by the bishops (bishop White and bishop Seabury appear to have been the only two present). The principal subjects of difference arising between the houses were the Athanasian creed, and the article in the Apostles' creed, concerning the "descent into hell." Bishop Seabury desired that permission should be granted in the rubric to use the Athanasian creed, and bishop White (who was opposed to the use of it, alleging that it was not in use amongst the Lutherans, nor in any part of the Greek Church) consented to his proposals; the lower house, however, refused to allow the use of this creed under any circumstances. The question concerning the article "He descended into hell," after much discussion, was finally settled in the convention of New York, A.D. 1792, where it was ordered that the article should stand in the creed, but that a rubric should be added, permitting the use of the words "He went into the places of departed spirits." Bishop Provost is said to have subsequently objected to this substitute, upon the ground that "it *exacted a belief in the existence of departed spirits between death and the Resurrection!*"

In the office for the holy eucharist, the oblatory words in the Prayer of Consecration, and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, were added without opposition, apparently at the suggestion of the excellent bishop Seabury.—*Bishop White's Memoirs*, pp. 28 and 140.

Philadelphia, 1795. PHILADELPHIA. At a triennial convention held in September, 1795, bishop White presiding; a service for the consecrating of churches was ordered; it is substantially the same with that composed by bishop Andrewes.—*Bp. White*, p. 30.

Philadelphia, 1835. PHILADELPHIA. Held in August, 1835; William White, D.D., bishop, presiding. Eight canons were published. All of which were repealed by the subsequent convention in 1838, except the fifth, which declares every minister to be amenable to the bishop for offences committed by him; also relates to the service of citations.

Philadelphia, 1838. PHILADELPHIA. A general convention held in September, 1838. Bishop Griswold presiding. Eleven canons were published.

1. Relates to the election of bishops. Rules that the house of bishops, at the request of any diocese in union with the American Church, shall nominate to the lower house a fit person for the office of bishop, who

shall, upon their concurrence, be consecrated for the said diocese. Philadelphia, 1838.

Section 2. Enacts that there must be at least six presbyters settled in the diocese, before its convention can elect their own bishop. Allows two or more dioceses, not having each the required number of presbyters, to unite temporarily, and to choose a bishop.

2. Of missionary bishops. Allows the lower house, from time to time, on the nomination of the house of bishops, to elect a fit person to be bishop, and to exercise episcopal functions in states or territories not organized into dioceses, who (§ 2) shall act in conformity with the canons and constitutions of the Church, and the rules prescribed by the house of bishops.

Section 3. Assigns to such missionary bishop jurisdiction over all clergymen in his district.

Section 4. Permits the consecration of bishops for places out of the territory of the United States.

Section 5. Declares such missionary bishops entitled to a seat in the house of bishops.

Section 6. Orders them to report their proceedings to each general convention, and also an annual report to the board of missions.

Section 7. Repeals canon 2 of 1835.

3. Of the performance of episcopal duties in vacant dioceses.

4. (Repealed by the 9th canon of 1841.)

5. Of the learning of those who are to be ordained. Forbids to ordain any person until he shall have satisfied the bishop and examining presbyters that he is well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, can read the Old Testament in the Hebrew, and the New Testament in the original Greek, and is adequately acquainted with Latin; also that he hath a competent knowledge of natural and moral philosophy, and Church history, and hath paid attention to composition and *pulpit eloquence.*

Grants to the bishop the power of dispensing with the knowledge of Greek and Latin and Hebrew in certain cases, as well as other qualifications not strictly ecclesiastical.

Repeals canon 13 of 1832.

6. Declares candidates for holy orders ineligible to the general convention.

7. Concerning candidates for holy orders who have

been ministers, &c., among other religious denominations.

8. Of the organization of new dioceses formed out of existing dioceses.

9. Of the mode of publishing authorized editions of the Book of Common Prayer, &c. Enacts that the bishop of the diocese or standing committee shall appoint one or more presbyters, who shall compare and correct all new editions of the Prayer-book, offices, articles, and metre psalms and hymns by some standard book, and that a certificate of the correctness of the said editions shall be published with them. When any book is published without such revision, public notice shall be given that such edition is not authorized by the Church.

Section 2. Declares the stereotype edition of the Prayer-book by the "Female" Episcopal Prayer-book Society of Philadelphia to be the standard edition.

Repeals canon 6 of 1835.

10. Of defraying the expences of general conventions.

11. Of repealed canons.

Philadelphia, 1844.

PHILADELPHIA. Held October 2, 1844. The right reverend Philander Chase, bishop of Illinois, presiding over twenty-three bishops. The synod lasted twenty-two days, and the following canons were passed.

1. Of the expences of general conventions. Enacts that the treasurer of the several diocesan conventions shall forward to the treasurer of the general convention before the meeting one dollar for each clergyman within the diocese.

Repeals canon 10 of 1838.

2. Of the election of bishops. Enacts that to entitle a diocese to choose a bishop, there must have been settled in it for a year previously six officiating presbyters. Permits two or more dioceses not having each the required number of presbyters, to associate for the purpose of electing a bishop, if there have been for a year previously nine officiating presbyters in the two dioceses. When six or more officiating presbyters become settled in either of the dioceses, and shall proceed to elect the bishop of the associated dioceses for their own exclusive diocesan, his connexion with the other diocese to cease.

Repeals canon 1 of 1838.

3. Of the trial of a bishop. Repeals canon 4 of 1841.

4. Of episcopal resignations. Orders a bishop to make known, in writing, to the house of bishops his desire to resign, and the reasons of it, that they may investigate the matter; after which the question to be decided by the majority of votes.

Also provides for the case of a bishop wishing to resign at any period beyond six months from the time of holding the general convention.

Repeals canon 32 of 1832.

5. Of ministers removing *from* one diocese to another. Enacts that no minister removing from one diocese to another, be received as a stated officiating minister by any parish without a certificate from the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese to which the parish belongs; the said minister removing, having previously presented to such ecclesiastical authority a testimonial from the ecclesiastical authority of his last diocese. Then follows a form of testimonial.

Enacts, further, that no clergyman shall be considered to have passed from under the jurisdiction of any diocese to that of any other bishop, until he have received the above testimonial.

Enacts, further, that such letters shall be null and void, if not presented to the bishop to whom they are directed within six months after date, if intended for the United States; and within twelve months, if intended for a foreign country.

Repeals canon 7 of 1841.

6. Of a discretion to be allowed in the calling, trial, and examination of deacons in certain cases.

Allows any bishop, at the request of the convention of his diocese, to admit persons to deacon's orders who have not been tried and examined, as directed by the canons, under certain restrictions, which follow.

Forbids a deacon so ordained to take charge of a parish; and declares that he shall not be admitted to priest's orders without first going through all the preparatory exercise for deacon's orders.

7. Of foreign missionary bishops.

(1.) Enacts that the house of clerical and lay deputies may, from time to time, on nomination by the house of bishops, elect suitable persons to be bishops, to exercise

Philadelphia, 1844.

episcopal functions in any place out of the territory of the United States, which the house of bishops may designate; and that if the house of bishops shall consent to the consecration, they shall take order for that purpose.

(2.) Any bishop elected and consecrated under this canon to have no jurisdiction except in the place or country for which he has been elected and consecrated; and not to be entitled to a seat in the house of bishops, nor to be eligible to the office of diocesan bishop in any organized diocese within the United States.

(3.) That any bishop or bishops elected and consecrated under this canon, may ordain deacons or presbyters, to officiate within the limits of their respective missions.

(4.) That any foreign missionary bishop, consecrated under this canon, may, by and with the advice of any three missionary presbyters under his charge, at his discretion, dispense with those studies required from a candidate for deacon's orders by the canons of this Church.

(5.) That in addition to the promise required in the office for the consecration of bishops, of conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, any foreign missionary bishop elected and consecrated under this canon, shall lodge with the senior bishop, or with the bishop who may act as consecrator, a promise under his hand and seal, that he will, in the exercise of his episcopal functions, conform, so far as may be possible in his peculiar circumstances, in all respects to the constitutions and canons of this Church.

(6.) That any foreign missionary bishop or bishops elected and consecrated under this canon, shall have jurisdiction and government, according to the canons of this Church, over all missionaries or clergymen of this Church resident in the district or country for which he may have been consecrated.

(7.) That every bishop elected and consecrated under this canon, shall report to each general convention his proceedings and acts, and the state of the mission under his supervision. He shall also make a similar report,

at least once every year, to the board of missions of this Church. Philadelphia, 1844.

8. Of missionary bishops within the United States.

(1.) The house of clerical and lay deputies may, from time to time, on nomination by the house of bishops, elect a suitable person to be a bishop, to exercise episcopal functions in states or territories not organized into dioceses; and if the house of bishops shall consent to the consecration, they may take order for that purpose.

(3.) The jurisdiction of this Church, extending in right, though not always in form, to all persons belonging to it within the United States, it is hereby enacted, that each missionary bishop shall have jurisdiction over the clergy in the district assigned him.

(4.) Any bishop or bishops elected and consecrated under this canon, shall be entitled to a seat in the house of bishops, and shall be eligible to the office of diocesan bishop in any organized diocese within the United States.

(5.) Every such bishop shall report to each general convention his proceedings, and the state and condition of his church, and at least once a year make a report to the board of missions.

(6.) Canon 2 of 1838 is hereby repealed.

9. Of clergymen ordained in foreign countries, by bishops in communion with this Church.

(1.) A clergyman coming from a foreign country, and professing to have been ordained out of the United States, by a foreign bishop in communion with this Church, or by a bishop consecrated for a foreign country, by bishops of this Church under article 10 of the constitution, or by a missionary bishop elected to exercise episcopal functions in any place or places out of the United States, shall, before he be permitted to officiate in any parish or congregation, exhibit to the minister, or if there be no minister, to the vestry thereof, a certificate signed by the bishop of the diocese, or, if there be no bishop, the standing committee, duly convened, that his letters of orders are authentic, and given by some bishop in communion with this Church, and whose authority is acknowledged by this Church; and also that he has exhibited to the bishop or standing committee, satisfactory evidence of his pious and moral character, and his theological acquirements; and, in

Philadelphia, 1844.

any case, before he shall be permitted to settle in any church or parish, or be received into union with any diocese of this Church, as a minister thereof, he shall produce to the bishop, or if there be no bishop, the standing committee of such diocese, a letter of dismission, from under the hand and seal of the bishop with whose diocese he has been last connected; which letter shall be, in substance, that provided for in section 1 of canon 5 of 1844, and shall be delivered within six months from the date thereof; and when such clergyman shall have been so received, he shall be considered as having passed entirely from the jurisdiction of the bishop, from whom the letter of dismission was brought, to the full jurisdiction of the bishop or other ecclesiastical authority by whom it shall have been accepted, and become thereby subject to all the canonical provisions of this Church; *provided* that no such clergyman shall be so received into union with any diocese, until he shall have subscribed, in the presence of the bishop of the diocese, in which he applies for reception, and two or more presbyters, the declaration contained in article 7 of the constitution; which being done, said bishop or standing committee being satisfied of his theological acquirements, may receive him into union with this Church, as a minister of the same: *provided also*, that such minister shall not be entitled to settle in any parish or church, as canonically in charge of the same, until he have resided one year in the United States subsequent to the acceptance of his letter of dismission.

(2.) And if such foreign clergyman be a deacon, he shall reside in this country at least three years, and obtain in this country the requisite testimonials of character, before he be ordained a priest.

(3.) Canon 6 of 1841 is hereby repealed.

Sentence of suspension was in the seventeenth session, October 21, passed upon Henry V. Onderdonk, bishop of Pennsylvania, he having first made a written acknowledgment of his unworthiness. Three bishops were consecrated for the dioceses of New Hampshire, Alabama, and Missouri; as were also missionary bishops for China, for Cape Palmas, on the western coast of Africa, for the dominions and dependencies of the sultan of Turkey, and for the state of Arkansas, together with some portion of the Indian territory.

In the fourteenth session, October 17, a report of the

state of the Church in the United States, made according to the provisions of canon 8, A.D. 1841, was sent up by the lower house, of which the tabular statements will be found at the end of this work.

In the last session a resolution was passed to the effect, that the bishops, as visitors, having visited the general theological seminary, had not found in its interior arrangements any evidences of encouragement given to superstitious or Romish practices[3].—*Journal of the General Convention for the year* 1844, published at New York.

PISA. [*Concilium Pisanum.*] Convoked by pope Innocentius II. in 1134, who presided at the head of a large assembly of the bishops of France, Germany, and Italy. S. Bernard assisted at their deliberations. The anti-pope, Anacletus, was again excommunicated, together with his abettors. Several canons were published. Pisa, 1134.

1. Directs that priests shall be separated from their wives, and nuns from their pretended husbands; and both parties be put to penance.

6. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to violate the sanctuary of a church or churchyard.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 989.

[3] It seems that some absurd charge of favouring popish views and practices had been brought against the institution; in consequence of which, the visiting bishops addressed a formidable list of questions to the professors, which, with their answers, were printed by order of the Convention.

Connected with this matter, another amusing case was brought before the synod. It seems that the dean of faculty for the year, one Samuel Turner, had been much scandalized by the sight of a wooden cross, about two feet high, decorated with flowers and evergreens, which he detected, on the afternoon of Christmas-Eve, on the chancel rails of the chapel. This, I understand, is not an uncommon custom in the Churches of the United States; but Mr. Turner, it seems, preferred to connect the observation of the pious custom, in this particular case, with the popish feelings and predilections which he imagined to be then rife in the seminary; and he was confirmed in this view by finding that the students, on the night of that same day, had met together for service in the chapel, desiring so to keep the vigil of our Lord's Nativity. However irregular the latter proceeding may have been, the professor is certainly incorrect in declaring that the Church of England uses the term "vigil" in a sense *equivalent* to that of "even," since she plainly distinguishes the former as a day of watching and fasting, whereas every Sunday and holy day has its eve or even. The correspondence on the subject is published in the Appendix to the Journal of the convention.

Pisa, 1409, false ystyled by some œcumenical.

PISA. Held March 25, 1409. The object of this council was to put an end to the schism then existing. The cardinals of the two obediences, viz. of Benedict XIII. and of Gregory XII., having addressed themselves to Charles VI. of France, exhorting him to concur with them in this important work; they came to the conclusion that the cardinals, under the circumstances, had an undoubted right to convoke a council, which might judge between the two competitors for the popedom, and elect a pope.

Benedict, by the advice of several bishops, sent seven legates to the council; but Gregory, on the other hand, refused to appear either in person or by deputy, although summoned in due form.

Session I. March 21.

The council was opened on the 25th of March, 1409. The assembly was one of the most august and numerous ever seen in the Church; there were present twenty-two cardinals; the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria (Simon), Antioch (Wenceslaus), Jerusalem (Hugo), and Grade (Francis Lando); twelve archbishops were present in person, and fourteen by their proctors; eighty bishops, and the proctors of one hundred and two absent; eighty-seven abbots, and the proctors of two hundred others; besides priors; generals of orders; the grand-master of Rhodes, with sixteen commanders; the prior-general of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre; the deputy of the grand-master and Knights of the Teutonic Order; the deputies of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Florence, Cracow, Vienna, Prague, and many others; more than three hundred doctors in theology; and ambassadors from the kings of England, France, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; from the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, &c.[4]

Session 1. The order of precedency to be observed by the members of the council was laid down.

Session II. March 26.

Session 2. After the usual prayer and sermon, the

[4] The names of those present as ambassadors and deputies from England, are as follows:—Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury; Henry, bishop of St. David's [Menevensis]; Thomas, abbot of the monastery of S. Mary at York; Richard, abbot of the monastery of S. Mary at Jorvaux; Thomas, prior of the Cistercians at Canterbury; the earl of Suffolk; sir John Ochul (or Colme), knight; Dr. Richard Camascon, or Caningston. There were also deputies from seventy-eight abbeys, and twenty-eight other monastic houses in England, and the proctors of sixteen English bishops.

archbishop of Pisa read the decree of Gregory X. upon the procession of the Holy Spirit, to which the Greeks had agreed in the council of Lyons, A. D. 1274, and the canon of Toledo relating to the proper order of ecclesiastical councils. After this the necessary officers were appointed, the letter of convocation read, and the two rival popes summoned at the gates of the church; no one, however, appearing for them, Pisa, 1409.

Session 3. A fresh citation was made, and no one having appeared, the two popes, Pedro of Luna and Angelo Corrario, were declared contumacious by a sentence, which was affixed to the church-door. Session III. March 30.

Session 4. Bishop Ulric, the ambassador of Robert, king of the Romans, addressed the assembly, endeavouring to frustrate the object of the council. Session IV. April 15.

Session 5. The two contending parties were again declared contumacious, and the promoter of the council produced against them thirty-seven articles, containing the whole history of the schism, and showing the badness of their cause. Although the facts contained in this accusation were sufficiently notorious, commissioners were appointed to prove their truth. Session V. April 24.

Session 6. The bishop of Salisbury showed that it was necessary for the cause that there should be a *general*, and not merely a *partial*, withdrawal from the obedience of the popes, and declared that he had authority from the king of England to follow out the scheme for unity, and to consent to whatever the council should determine. Session VI. April 30.

Session 7. The difficulties started by the ambassador of the king of the Romans were answered. Session VII. May 4.

Session 8. The bishops of Salisbury and Evreux showed that the union of the two colleges of cardinals could not be effected whilst those of the party of Benedict continued to obey him, and that the withdrawal from obedience must be universal. Whereupon the council declared the union of the two colleges to be lawful, and the council itself duly convoked; and a decree was passed to the effect, that each one might, and ought, to withdraw from the obedience both of Gregory and Benedict; since both of them had by their artifices eluded the solemn cession of office, which they had promised upon oath to make. Session VIII. May 10.

Session 9. The decree of the preceding session was read. Session IX. May 17.

Pisa, 1409. Session X. May 22. Session 10. The two contending parties were again cited at the door of the church, in order that they might hear the testimony of the witnesses. Then thirty-seven articles, containing their deposition, were read; and it was noted down by how many witnesses each article was proved.

Session XI. May 23. Session 11. The reading of the depositions was continued.

Session XII. May 25. Session 12. A decree was published declaring the council to be œcumenical, and all contained in the preceding depositions to be true, public, and notorious.

Session XIII. May 29. Session 13. One of the deputies from the university of Paris showed that Pedro of Luna was a heretic and schismatic, and that he had forfeited the papacy; and this he declared to be the opinion of the French universities. The bishop of Navarre also declared that all the doctors in the council, to the number of three hundred, agreed in this view.

Session XIV. June 5. Session 14. A declaration was made that the council represented the Catholic Church, that the cognizance of the matter before it of right belonged to it, as being the highest authority on earth; also an act of general withdrawal from the obedience of the two contending parties was drawn up.

Session XV. June 5. Session 15. The definitive sentence was pronounced in the presence of the whole council and of the people who were permitted to enter. The sentence was to the effect, that the holy œcumenical synod, representing the Catholic Church, to which it appertained to take cognizance of and to decide the question, after having examined every thing which had been done concerning the union of the Church, declared Pedro of Luna, called Benedict XIII., and Angelo Corrario, called Gregory XII., to be both of them schismatical, abettors of schism, heretics, and guilty of perjury; that they had given offence to the whole Church by their obstinacy, that they had forfeited every dignity, and were, *ipso facto*, separated from the Church. And forbade all the faithful, under pain of excommunication, to recognize them, or support their cause. Annulled all that they had done against the promoters of unity, and declared the last promotion of cardinals made by them to be null and void.

Session XVI. June 10. Session 16. A paper was read, in which the cardinals present all promised, that in the event of any one of

them being elected to the papal chair, he would continue the present council, until the Church should be reformed in its head and in its members; and if one of those then absent, or any other not belonging to the college of cardinals, were elected, that they would compel him to make the same promise before publishing his election. Afterwards the council ratified the sentence against Angelo and Pedro. Pisa, 1409.

Session 17. Certain preliminaries concerning the election were settled. Session XVII. June 13.

Session 18. A solemn procession was made to implore of the Almighty the grace necessary to guide their election. Session XVIII. June 14.

Session 19 [5]. The cardinals, to the number of twenty-four, entered into conclave under the guard of the grand-master of Rhodes, and at the end of ten days' confinement, they unanimously elected Peter of Candia, cardinal of Milan, of the order of Franciscan friars, a man seventy years of age, who took the name of Alexander V. As soon as he was elected, John Gerson, chancellor of the university of Paris, delivered a discourse, exhorting him to the faithful discharge of his duty, &c. Session XIX. June 15.

Session 20. The new pope presided and delivered a discourse. The decree of his election was then read, and on the following Sunday he was crowned. Session XX. July 1.

Session 21. A decree was read on the part of the pope, approving and ratifying all the dispensations of marriage, and those relating to the penitentiary, which had been granted by Benedict or Gregory. Session XXI. July 10.

Session 22. A decree was published on the part of the pope and council, confirming all collations, provisions, translations, &c. &c. &c., made canonically by the two rival popes. Session XXII. July 27.

Session 23. A decree was read, ordering metropolitans to convoke provincial councils, and the generals of orders to hold chapters, having presidents of the pope's appointment. Finally, Alexander ratified all that the cardinals had done since the 3rd of May, 1408, and especially what had passed at Pisa [6]. With regard to Session XXIII. Aug. 7.

[5] According to some accounts, the cardinals entered into conclave in the eighteenth session, and the new pope presided in the nineteenth session, held July 1st.

[6] According to Raynaldus, this was done in the twentieth session, held July 1st.

Church reform, as many of the prelates had left the council, the pope declared that the subject should be deferred until the following council, which he appointed to be held in 1412; then he dismissed the assembly, giving plenary indulgence to all who had assisted at it, and to all who had adhered to it.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2114. *Hist. du Conc. de Pisa, by Lenfant.*

Pisa and Milan, 1511.

PISA and MILAN. Held in 1511, at the instigation of the emperors Maximilian and Louis XII. of France, who having just cause of complaint against pope Julius II., persuaded the cardinals of S. Croix, Narbonne, and Cosenzi, to convoke a council to Pisa.

The object of the council was set forth to be the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, and to punish various notorious crimes which for a long time had scandalized the whole Church. It was further stated, that there was urgent need of such councils, that Julius had not only neglected to convoke one, but had done all in his power to hinder it; and, finally, the pope was in respectful terms cited to appear at the council.

Besides this, in answer to the complaint made against them by Julius, they published an apology for their conduct, in which they justified the convocation of the council of Pisa: First, By a decree passed in the thirty-ninth session of the council. Secondly, By the pope's own vow, according to which he had promised to hold a council. Thirdly, By the oath of the cardinals, and by the necessity of avoiding so great scandal. They further showed that the canons, which vest the power of convoking such councils in the pope, are to be understood as speaking of the ordinary state of things, but that cause may arise in which councils may be called and assembled by others than the sovereign Pontiff.

The pope, in order to parry the blow, convoked a rival council to Rome, and cited the three above mentioned cardinals to appear there within a certain time, under pain of being deprived.

The council of Pisa, however, proceeded, and was opened November 1st, 1511. Four cardinals attended, and the proctors of three who were absent, also fourteen French bishops and two archbishops, together with a few abbots and doctors; deputies from the universities of France, and the ambassadors of Louis XII.

Session 1. Nov. 5.

Cardinal S. Croix presided. The convocation of the council of Pisa, having for its object the reformation of

the Church, was pronounced to be just and lawful, and all that had been or might be done to its prejudice declared null and void. Pisa and Milan, 1511.

All that related to the order of the assembly was settled; the canon of Toledo read, and officers appointed. A decree was made to the effect, that the present council could not be dissolved until the reformation of the Church should have been effected. The decrees of the council of Constance, relating to the authority of œcumenical councils, were renewed. Session II. Nov. 7.

At this time, the pope having entered into a league with Ferdinand and the Venetians, began to attack the state of Florence, and the fathers judged it expedient to transfer the council to Milan; which accordingly was done; and on the 4th of January, 1512, the fourth session was held at Milan. Session III. Nov. 8.

In the fourth session the assembly was more numerous, the cardinals of S. Severin and S. Angelo joined themselves to the others. The proctor general of the order of premonstrants made a long discourse upon the disorders which ravaged the Church; then certain decrees were read, by which thirty days were given to the pope, within which time to determine himself to reform abuses in the Church, or else to assemble an œcumenical council, or to unite with that already assembled. Milan, Session IV.

The decree of the council of Constance was renewed against those who troubled and maltreated persons coming to the council. Session V. Feb. 11,

A deputy from the university of Paris delivered a discourse, after which the pope Julius was again cited in the usual form; and upon his non-appearance, a demand was made that he should be declared contumacious. Several decrees were also published, amongst other subjects, upon the exemplary life which ecclesiastics ought to lead; also upon the order to be observed in councils, with regard to sessions and congregations. The convocation of a council to Rome, made by Julius, was declared null and void. Session VI. March 24.

The promoters of the council required that Julius should be declared, through his contumacy, to have incurred, *ipso facto*, suspension from all administration of the pontifical office. Consequently he was called upon three times from the foot of the altar, and at the church door: the settlement of the question was then deferred till the next session. Session VII. April 19.

Session VIII. April 21.

After mass, sung by the bishop of Maguelonne (now Montpellier), a decree was made suspending Julius, and the council, after reciting all that had been done in order to obtain his protection, exhorted all cardinals, bishops, princes, and people, no longer to recognize Julius as pope, he having been declared contumacious, the author of schism, incorrigible and hardened, and having as such incurred the penalties denounced in the decrees of Constance and Basle.

This was the last session of the council, for the French being obliged to abandon the Milanese, the bishops were compelled to quit Milan; they made an attempt to continue the council at Lyons, but without effect.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1486. *Du Pin, Comp. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 4.

Placenza, 1095.

PLACENZA. [*Concilium Placentinum.*] Held March 1st, 1095, and concluded March 5th, by pope Urban II. Two hundred bishops attended, with nearly four thousand other ecclesiastics, and thirty thousand laymen. The first and third sessions of this assembly were necessarily held in the open air[8]. The empress Praxedis, in person, made complaint against her husband the emperor Henry, who divorced her and treated her infamously. Ambassadors from the emperor of Constantinople were present, who demanded help against the infidels, with the approbation of the pope. Fifteen canons were published, by which the heresy of Berenger was again condemned, and the truth of the real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the holy eucharist clearly set forth. The sect of the New Nicolaitans (who favoured incontinence in the clergy) were also condemned. The orders conferred by Guibert, the antipope, and others who had been excommunicated, were declared null. The Ember fasts were also fixed. After this, Urban proceeded to France, and in the Autumn of the same year held the celebrated council of Clermont.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 500.

Placenza, 1132.

PLACENZA. Held after Easter, 1132, by Innocentius II., assisted by several bishops of Lombardy. It was forbidden to receive to penitence those who

[8] Berthold, who was present, says, "This synod was held about the middle of Lent, at Placenza, and so innumerable were the multitude of persons who flocked to it, that no church could be found in those parts capable of containing them, therefore the pope was compelled to hold it in the open air, without the city."

refused to renounce fornication, hatred and every mortal sin. In this council the antipope, Anacletus, was excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 988.

POISSI. An assembly of French bishops was held at Poissi in 1561, in consequence of the celebrated conference of the same name. Several regulations relating to discipline were made. Poissi, 1561.

Concerning the elections of bishops, it is ordered that the name of the person nominated by the king to a bishopric shall be posted at the cathedral doors, and in other public places, that all persons may have the opportunity of objecting to him if they know any thing against him.

Archbishops and bishops are forbidden to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than three months; are exhorted to apply themselves to preaching and visitations, and to hold annual synods.

Archbishops are directed to summon provincial councils every three years, according to the decrees of the council of Basle. Excommunications, save for weighty reasons, are forbidden. Curates not to be admitted to their benefices until they have been examined by the bishop: they are ordered to proceed to priest's orders within a year from their admission; to reside constantly; to explain the Gospel to their people, and to teach them to pray. Private masses are forbidden to be said whilst solemn mass is being celebrated.

Priests are enjoined to prepare themselves carefully before approaching the holy altar; to pronounce the words distinctly; to do all with decency and gravity; not to suffer any airs, save those of hymns and canticles, to be played upon the organ; to correct the church books; to try to abolish all superstitious practices; to instruct the people that images are exposed to view in the churches for no other reason than to remind persons of Jesus Christ and the saints. It is further directed that all images which are in any way indecent, or which merely illustrate fabulous and ridiculous tales, shall be entirely removed.

These regulations are closed by a profession of faith, in which the errors of Luther and Calvin, and other sectarians, are specially rejected.

POITIERS. [*Concilium Pictaviense.*] Held in 593, in the matter of a nun named Chrodielde, of royal blood, who had rebelled against Leubovera, abbess of S. Croix Poitiers, 593.

Poitiers, 593.

in Poitiers. She was here called to account for leaving her nunnery, and for the violence which she had committed against Gondegesile and other bishops; also for the acts of rebellion which she, in concert with Besina, another nun, had committed against their abbess. Being exhorted to ask forgiveness of the abbess, she boldly refused, and threatened to kill her. The bishops, after consulting the canons, declared her to be excommunicated, and ordered that she should remain so until she should have done penance. They then re-established the abbess, Leubovera, in the government of the monastery.[8].—*Gregory of Tours.* Tom. v. Conc. p. 1593.

[8] The particulars of this extraordinary outbreak were as follows:—Chrodielde, daughter of king Charibert, and Basina, daughter of Chilperic, had taken the veil in the nunnery of Poictiers, under S. Radegund, the foundress. Upon her death, Leubovera was made abbess, with whom the princesses could not agree. They endeavoured at first, by accusing her of various crimes, to get her removed, and one of themselves put into her place; but when this did not succeed, they resolved to leave the house; and having made a tumult and sedition, they broke open the gates, and marched forth at the head of forty other nuns, whom they had seduced. From Poictiers they walked to Tours, in the month of February, the roads having been half washed away by the heavy rains, and almost without any food to eat, for no one would supply them on the road. From Tours Chrodielde proceeded to king Gontheram; but meeting with no success in her complaints against the abbess, she returned to her companions at Tours, many of the fugitive nuns, in the mean time, having found husbands. The two unruly princesses now took up their abode in the Basilica of St. Hilary, whence they sent an armed band to seize upon the nunnery at Poictiers, and to bring away the abbess (who at the time was unhappily laid up) in bonds. This was done, and the abbess brought to the Basilica, whence, however, she escaped. But now Gondegesile, bishop of Bordeaux, taking with him other ecclesiastics, proceeded to the Basilica of S. Hilary, to hold a parley with the warlike ladies, and to persuade them to return to their house; but with bad success, for an attack being made upon them in the church by the armed followers of the fugitive nuns, the bishops were overthrown upon the pavement, and the others of their party so ill used, that, as Gregory of Tours writes, the deacons and other clerks, sprinkled with blood, and with their heads broken, rushed from the church, and fled each one back to his own home, without so much as saying a word to one another. After this, Chrodielde paraded about the neighbourhood of the nunnery with her band, seizing upon every nun whom she could find, and compelling her to join her company, at the same time vowing to throw the abbess over the wall if ever she got inside the convent. Things having gone this length, the two kings, Childebert and Gontheram, ordered that a general convention of the bishops of both kingdoms should be held, to rectify all these abuses. The assembly was accord-

POITIERS. Held January 13th, 1004, convoked by William V., count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine, Five bishops were present, who published three canons. Poitiers, 1004.

1. Pronounces those persons to be under anathema who pillage the churches, rob the poor, or strike the clergy: and further declares, that if they rebel against this sentence, the bishops and barons shall assemble and march against them, ravaging all around them until they submit.

The other two canons forbid bishops to take any fees for penance and confirmation; and priests and deacons to retain women in their houses.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 780.

POITIERS. Held in 1073, before cardinal Gerand, the Roman legate, against Berenger. The question of the holy eucharist was discussed, and the minds of men were so exasperated against Berenger, that he narrowly escaped with his life.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 346. Poitiers, 1073.

POITIERS. Held in 1078, by the legate Hugo, bishop of Die; who, by the account which he gave of this council to pope Gregory VII., seems to have encountered much opposition to his plans. He complains that the king of France had forbidden the count of Poitiers to allow the council to be holden within his states; that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Rennes had rendered themselves almost complete masters of the council, and that the assembly had been disturbed by the armed followers of these prelates. Some attribute to this council, and others to the following one, ten canons, of which these are the most worthy of note. Poitiers, 1078.

1. Forbids to receive investitures at the hands of kings and other laymen.

2. Forbids simony and pluralities.

4. Forbids bishops to receive any present for conferring holy orders, for consecrating churches, or for giving any benediction.

6. Forbids monks and canons to purchase churches without the bishop's consent.

ingly held at Poictiers. The abbess was declared innocent of the charges brought against her, except in some trifling matters; and Chrodielde and her followers were excommunicated, until such time as they should have done penance worthy of their offence. Basina seems to have previously repented. (See C. of Metz, 590.) Much more upon the subject may be seen in Baronius, A.D. 593, lxiii. &c.

8. Forbids the ordination of the children of priests, and of bastards, except they be canons or regular monks.

10. Enjoins that clerks who carry arms, or who deal in usury, shall be excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 366.

Poitiers, 1100. POITIERS. Held November 18, 1100, by John and Benedict, the two legates of the holy see, who presided in the place of Pascal II. About eighty bishops and abbots were present. Norigaudus, bishop of Autun, having been found guilty of simony, was condemned to give up his stole and pastoral ring. Upon his refusal to do so, he was further deposed from his bishopric and from the priesthood, and sentence of excommunication was denounced against all who continued to obey him as their bishop. He, nevertheless, persisted in his refusal to submit to the sentence, and retained his stole and ring. In this council, moreover, Philip, king of France, who had taken back to him Bertrade, his wife, was excommunicated by the legates, in spite of the opposition of many of the bishops and of William, duke of Aquitaine. Lastly, sixteen canons were published.

1. Declares that it is lawful for bishops only to give the tonsure (coronas benedicere) to the clergy, and for abbots to do so to monks.

2. Forbids them to require any fee for performing the operation, or even the scissors and napkin employed.

4. Reserves to the bishop the benediction of the sacerdotal vestments, and of all the vessels, &c. of the altar.

7. Forbids, under excommunication, to buy or sell prebends, and to require any allowance (pastus) for having given one.

10. Gives permission to regular canons to baptize, preach, administer the sacrament of penance, and bury the dead during the bishop's pleasure.

12. Forbids to allow to preach those who carry about the relics of saints for the sake of gain.

16. Confirms all that the pope had enacted in the council of Clermont.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 720.

Polotsk, 1839. POLOTSK. Held on the 12th of February, 1839, by all the Greek Uniate bishops in Russia, assisted by several of the most distinguished of their clergy. In

this council a synodal act was drawn up, and signed by Joseph, bishop of Lithuania; Vasili, bishop of Orsha; Anthony, bishop of Brest; and twenty-one other dignitaries; in which they declare their firm and unalterable decision "to acknowledge anew the unity of their Church with the orthodox Catholic Eastern Church; and, consequently, thenceforth, together with the flocks committed to their care, to continue in the same sentiment with the holy eastern orthodox patriarchs, and in obedience to the holy governing synod of all the Russias." To this act was appended the declaration of thirteen hundred and five parish priests and monastic brethren, which number was afterwards increased to sixteen hundred and seven. Besides their act, a petition was drawn up to the emperor Nicholas, praying him to sanction the union of the Uniate with the orthodox Church; which, together with the synodal act above, was submitted to the holy governing synod for examination and approval. The synod shortly after issued its decree upon the subject, by which it was ordained: Polotsk, 1839.

1. To receive the bishops, clergy, and flocks of the hitherto called Greek Uniate Church into full and complete communion with the holy orthodox, Catholic Eastern Church, and so to be integrally and inseparably incorporated with the Church of all the Russias.

2. To confer the general blessing of the most holy synod on the bishops and clergy in particular, with prayer of faith and love to the supreme bishop of our confession, Jesus Christ, that He would confirm them from above in the confession they have made, and that He would rightly direct the work of their ministry, to the perfecting of the saints.

3. That in the governing those flocks which are entrusted to them, they shall take as their fundamental guide the word of God, the canons of the Church, and the laws of the empire, and shall confirm the flocks entrusted to them in the same sentiments with those of the orthodox faith; and that they exhibit an apostolical indulgence to any differences in local customs which do not affect the doctrines or the sacraments, and bring back their people to the ancient uniformity by free persuasion, without violence, with gentleness and long-suffering.

This decree was signed by Seraphim, metropolitan of Novogorod and S. Petersburg, by Philaret of Kieff,

Philaret of Moscow, and three prelates, besides two other ecclesiastics. It was confirmed March 25, 1839, by the emperor's own hand, with these words: "I thank God, and accept it."—*Mouravieffe, by Blackmore*, Append. iv. p. 430.

Pont-audemer, 1279.

PONT-AUDEMER. [*Concilium Pons-audemarense.*] Held in 1279, by William de Flavecour, archbishop of Rouen, who presided; twenty-four canons were published.

5. Recommends the observance of the canons of Lateran ("omnes utriusque sexus") upon confession and communion.

9. Forbids Christians to dwell with Jews.

10. Forbids the keeping of vigils and assemblies, and all dancing, in churches and churchyards.

16. Forbids rural deans to deliver any sentence of excommunication or suspension, unless in writing.

23. Forbids all those of the clergy who have taken the cross to abuse the privileges granted to them.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1144.

Pontyon, 876.

PONTYON. [*Concilium Pontigonense.*] Held in June and July, 876, by the Cisalpine bishops, the emperor Charles and the Roman legates being present. The pretensions of Ansegisus, metropolitan of Sens, whom pope John VIII., at the request of the emperor, had nominated primate of France and Germany (in violation of the canons and of the rights of the metropolitans) were brought before the council, and so resolutely opposed by the bishops, that the affair, for the time, came to nothing. The acts of the synod of Pavia, in the beginning of the year, were confirmed. Fifty-two bishops and archbishops subscribed the acts, together with five abbots.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 280.

Prague, 1346.

PRAGUE. [*Concilium Pragense.*] Held about the year 1346, by Ernest, first archbishop of Prague; several regulations were drawn up.

1. Relates to the faith.

3. Relates to abuses arising from the use of rescripts from Rome.

8. Forbids to allow a strange priest to assist at communion without letters from his own bishop.

11. Opposes the pretension of the delegates of Rome, upon the subject of interdicts.

21 and 22. Relate to the private life and morals of the clergy.

23. Deprives those who do not reside upon their benefices.—*Mansi*, Tom. iii. coll. 543, &c.

PRESBURG. [*Concilium Posoniense*] Held November 10, 1309, by cardinal Gentil, legate of the pope in Hungary. Nine canons of discipline were published, of which the eighth forbids Christian women to marry with infidels, heretics, or schismatics.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 2453. Presburg, 1309.

Q.

QUERCUS (or the Oak). A council was held at a place in the neighbourhood of Chalcedon, in 403, and is known as the "Concilium ad Quercum." Paul, bishop of Heraclea, presided. Theophilus of Alexandria, the open enemy of S. John Chrysostom, here succeeded in effecting his deposition, which was decreed by the thirty-six bishops present, amongst whom were Acacius of Berea, Severianus of Gabala, in Syria, Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Cyprian of Chalcedon. S. Chrysostom was cited, but refused to appear, unless Theophilus, Acacius, Antiochus, and others of his declared foes withdrew. Quercus, or the Oak, 403.

The emperor Arcadius, yielding to the wish of his wife Eudoxia, who had determined the ruin of Chrysostom, confirmed the judgment of the council, and banished him to Bithynia. However, an earthquake, which occurred on the very day of his departure, terrified the empress to such a degree, that he was instantly brought back, and re-entered Constantinople in triumph.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1323.

QUIERCY. [*Concilium Carisiacense.*] Held in 849, by Hincmar, and several [13] other bishops, who condemned Gothescalcus, a predestinarian, and sentenced him to be flogged and imprisoned at Hautvilliers, where he wrote a profession of faith similar to that which he had presented at the council of Mayence in 848.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 55. Quiercy, 849.

QUIERCY. Held in 858. In this council the bishops of the provinces of Rheims and Rouen wrote a long letter full of reproaches to Louis, king of Germany, blaming him for invading France upon the invitation of the disaffected nobles of Charles; and declaring that it had come to their ears, that in the course of his march through the various dioceses, cruelties and abominations Quiercy, 858.

had been committed, surpassing those of the heathen themselves.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 654.

R.

Ratisbon, 792. RATISBON. [*Concilium Ratisponense.*] Held in 792. In this council the errors of Felix, bishop of Urgel, who maintained that our Lord is only the *adoptive* Son of God, were condemned, and he himself sent to Rome to pope Adrian, before whom he confessed and abjured his heresy in the church of S. Peter; he maintained with Elipandus, that Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God by adoption only.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1010.

Ratisbon, 796. RATISBON. Held in 796. Grievous complaints having been made both by the priests and laity of the ministrations of the Chorepiscopi, it was decided in this council that the latter had no power to perform episcopal functions, being only priests, and that, consequently, all the previous acts were null and void; it was also forbidden to make any new Chorepiscopi. This rank, however, amongst the clergy did not entirely cease until the middle of the tenth century.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1152.

Ravenna, 877. RAVENNA. [*Concilium Ravennate.*] Held July 22, 877, by pope John VIII., at the head of forty-nine bishops[9]; the object of the council was to remedy the disorders of the Church. Nineteen chapters remain to us, relating to the discipline and privileges of the Church; also a letter, confirming the possession of a monastery to the bishop of Autun.

Chap. 1. Enjoins the metropolitan to send to Rome for the pallium within three months after his consecration, and forbids him to exercise any of the functions of his office until that be done.

2. Enjoins that all bishops elect shall be consecrated by their metropolitans within three months after election, under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids metropolitans to make use of the pallium, except on great festivals and during mass.

5, 6, 7, and 8, Excommunicate and anathematize those who rob the church, injure ecclesiastics, and commit various other crimes.

[9] Holstenius and Labbe say the number of bishops was 130.

9. Declares those persons to be themselves excommunicated who voluntarily communicate with the excommunicated.

12. Excommunicates those who absent themselves from their parish church on three Sundays successively.

19. Forbids judges and royal commissioners to hold courts and to lodge in churches.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 299.

RAVENNA. Held in 898, by John IX., in the matter of Formosus and Stephen[1]. The emperor Lambert being present and seventy-four bishops. Ten regulations were approved. Ravenna, 898 (or 904, *Labbe*).

1. Enacts the observation of the canons of the fathers, and all that is contained in the capitulars of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonnaire, Lothaire, and Louis II.

3. Confirms the privileges granted to the Church of Rome by the emperors.

4. Approves all that had been done in the council of Rome, A.D. 898, in the matter of Formosus.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Relate to the political circumstances of the Roman see.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 507.

RAVENNA. Held in April, 967. In this council the emperor, Otho I., yielded to the pope, John XIII., the city and territory of Ravenna. Heroldus, archbishop of Salzburg, was deposed and excommunicated; the act of deposition being subscribed on the 25th of April, by the emperor and fifty-seven bishops, including the pope. Lastly, Magdeburg was erected into an archbishopric: this, however, was not completed until the following year.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 674. Ravenna, 967.

RAVENNA. Held May 1st, 997, by Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight suffragans. Three canons remain, of which Ravenna, 997.

1. Condemns an infamous custom which existed in the cathedral of Ravenna, of selling the holy eucharist and chrism.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 766.

RAVENNA. Held April 30th, 1014, by the new archbishop, Arnold, to remedy the abuses caused by the long vacancy of eleven years, and the intrusion of Adelbert, who had unlawfully conferred holy orders and dedicated certain churches. It was determined that those upon whom orders had been thus conferred should remain suspended until the matter could be minutely Ravenna, 1014.

[1] See the Councils of Rome, A.D. 896 and 898.

considered; and that the consecrations of churches and oratories made by Adelbert were null and void.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 833.

Ravenna, 1128. RAVENNA. Held by Peter, cardinal of S. Anastasia, in 1128. Here the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, or Grade, were deposed, having been convicted of favouring schismatics.—*Pagi.* Tom. x. Conc. p. 936.

Ravenna, 1286. RAVENNA. Held in 1286, July 8th, by Bonifacius the archbishop, who presided, assisted by eight bishops, his suffragans. Nine canons were published.

2. Exhorts the clergy to almsgiving, and grants indulgences to those who feed and clothe the poor.

3. Relates to the dress of the clergy; and forbids them to carry arms without the bishop's permission.

5. Orders that the usual daily distributions shall be made only to those canons who attend the holy office.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1238.

Ravenna, 1310. RAVENNA. Held in 1310, by Rainaldus the archbishop, in the matter of the Templars. Present: eight bishops of the province, three inquisitors, two preaching friars, and one minorite: seven Templars were brought before them, who constantly affirmed their innocence. On the following day it was determined that they who had confessed from a fear of torture only, should be considered innocent: nevertheless, there were five who went through the canonical ordeal.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1533.

Ravenna, 1311. RAVENNA. Held in 1311, by Rainaldus the archbishop: five bishops and six proctors attending. Thirty-two canons were published.

2. Orders mass to be said daily for a month by the other bishops in behalf of a bishop deceased.

3. Orders that yearly, on the 20th of July, a solemn service shall be said for the deceased bishops; and that on that day twelve poor persons shall be fed.

4. Enjoins the same thing on behalf of patrons and benefactors of churches.

6. Orders that the sacraments be administered fasting.

10. Enjoins curates to warn the people every Sunday, after the gospel and offertory, of the festivals and fast days in the coming week.

11. Orders that the form of baptism shall be publicly said in church three times a year.

15. Orders that the canon "omnis utriusque sexus" shall be published at Advent and Lent. That medical men shall not visit a patient a second time if he have not called in the priest.

16. Forbids to give a benefice to any one who cannot read or chant.

18. Orders annual synods.

23. Orders that Jews shall wear a distinguishing badge.

26. Renews the canonical penalties for striking, maltreating, and driving the clergy from their churches.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1569.

RAVENNA. Held in 1314, by the same archbishop, assisted by six bishops and four deputies: twenty canons were published. Ravenna, 1314.

2. Forbids to ordain to the priesthood persons under twenty-five years of age: also to ordain a deacon under twenty, and a sub-deacon under sixteen years.

6. Orders that the church bells shall be rung when a bishop passes, that the people may come out to receive his blessing upon their knees: also regulates the form to be observed by the chapter of a cathedral upon the bishop's visit.

8. Declares, under pain of excommunication, that no monks, or other persons, can claim exemption from episcopal visitation upon plea of prescriptive right, or any other plea.

10. Enacts that the clergy shall be soberly dressed, that they shall not carry arms, nor dress in coloured clothes; that they shall wear a close cassock, observe the tonsure, and keep their hair cut short, &c.

11. Forbids men to enter the monastic houses of females.

14. Orders curates to teach their people the form of baptism at least once a year.

16. Orders fasting and almsgiving on the three days before the meeting of provincial councils.

29. Revokes the permission given to monks to preach indulgences.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1603.

RAVENNA. Held in 1317. See C. Bologna, 1317. Ravenna, 1317.

READING. [*Concilium Redingense.*] Held in July, 1279, by Friar John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by his suffragans. The constitutions of Othobon, made in the council of London A.D. Reading, 1279.

Reading, 1279. 1268, having been read, the twelve following constitutions were published:—

1. Renews the twenty-ninth constitution of Othobon against pluralities; and directs bishops to cause a register to be kept of all incumbents in their dioceses, with all particulars relating to them and their livings.

2. Relates to commendaries, and declares such as are held otherwise than the constitution of Gregory, made in the council of Lyons, 1273, permits, to be vacant.

3. Orders all priests, on the Sunday after every rural chapter, to explain to the people the sentences of excommunication decreed by the council of Oxford in 1222; and to publish four times in each year the constitutions of Othobon concerning baptism at Easter and Pentecost, and that concerning concubinaries at the four principal rural chapters, the laity being first dismissed.

4. Orders that children born within eight days of Pentecost and Easter shall be reserved to be baptized at these times; but that children born at other times shall be baptized at once, for fear of sudden death.

5. Orders the eighth constitution of Othobon (1268) against concubinary priests to be read openly in the four principal rural chapters, and declares that such reading shall be taken as a monition. If the dean or his deputy neglect this, he is directed to fast every Friday on bread and water until the next chapter.

6. Relates to the chrism: orders that what remains of the old chrism shall be burnt when the new is consecrated: directs that priests shall be bound to fetch the chrism for their Churches every year from their bishops before Easter: forbids to use any other than the new chrism, under the heaviest penalties.

7. Orders that the consecrated host be kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle: that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lanthorn being carried before, and a bell sounded, that the people may "make humble adoration wheresoever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread."

8. Declares the custom of praying for the dead to be "holy and wholesome;" and ordains that upon the death of any bishop of the province of Canterbury, his surviving brethren shall perform a solemn office for the dead, both singly in their chapels, and together, when

called to assemble in council or otherwise, after the death of the said bishop: orders further, every priest to say one mass for the soul of his deceased diocesan, and intreats all exempt religious priests and seculars to do likewise. Reading, 1279.

9. Relates to the preaching of indulgences, and orders caution in so doing, "lest the keys of the Church be despised."

10. Forbids to set free, or admit to purgation, on slight grounds, clerks who having been put into prison for their crimes, are delivered to the Church as convicts.

11. Enjoins that care be taken to preserve the chastity of friars and nuns: forbids them to sojourn long in the houses of their parents and friends.

12. Forbids parishioners to dispose of the grass, trees, or roots, growing in consecrated ground; leaves such produce at the disposal of the rectors: forbids the latter, without sufficient cause, to spoil or grub up such trees as are an ornament to the churchyards and places thereabouts.

Then follows (in some copies) an injunction that the clergy of each diocese should send at least *two* deputies to the next congregation, to treat with the bishops for the common interests of the Church of England. This injunction, however, is by some persons said to be not genuine.

In this same council a deed protecting the liberties of the scholars at Oxford was drawn up, in which the archbishop declared that, "moved by their devout prayers, he received under his protection their persons and property, and confirmed to them and their successors the liberties and immunities granted to them by bishops, kings, and others of the faithful:" it is also provided that sentences of suspension and excommunication passed by the chancellor, or his deputies, &c., upon men on account of offences committed by them in the Uuiversity, shall be put into execution throughout the province of Canterbury: further, it is ordered that the benefices of clerks found in arms by day or night, to the disturbance of the peace of the University, shall be sequestered for three years; and if the clerks so offending be unbeneficed, they shall be incapable of holding any benefice for five years, unless they shall make competent satisfaction in the interim.

Thirteen prelates attended this council, viz. the archbishop, and the bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Worcester, Bath, Landaff, Hereford, Norwich, Bangor, Rochester.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1062. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. ii. p. 33.

Rennes, 1273. RENNES. [*Concilium Redenense.*] Held on the Monday after Ascension-day, 1273. Seven chapters were published.

1. Enacts that any one laying violent hands upon a bishop, abbot, or abbess, or setting fire to their houses, shall, if a clerk, be delivered over to anathema, and forbidden to hold any sort of ecclesiastical preferment; if a layman, shall be excluded with his children to the third generation from receiving holy orders.

6. Allows bishops to absolve persons in their own diocese excommunicated by the present council.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 933.

Rheims, 624. RHEIMS. [*Concilium Remense.*] Held in 624 or 625, by the archbishop Sonnatius, at the head of forty, or more, Gallican bishops. Twenty-five canons were published.

2. Directs that clerks who cabal against their bishops shall be deposed.

3. Confirms the canons of Paris (made in 614).

7. Defends the inviolability of the asylum afforded by churches.

13. Forbids bishops to sell slaves or other property belonging to the Church.

20. Forbids a bishop to injure the vessels of the church, unless it be in order to redeem captives.

25. Directs that no one be consecrated bishop of any see unless he belong to that country, have been elected by all the people and bishops of the province, and have been approved by the whole council.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1688.

Rheims, 813. RHEIMS. Held in May, 819, by Vulfairius, or Wilfarius, the archbishop, who presided. The council was preceded, according to custom, by a fast of three days. Forty-four canons were drawn up.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 1253.

Rheims, or S. Basle, 991. RHEIMS (or S. Basle). Held June 17, 991, by order of Hugo Capet, against Arnulphus, archbishop of Rheims, and son of Lothaire, who was suspected of carrying on a secret intelligence with his uncle, Charles

of Lorraine. Sequinus, archbishop of Sens, presided, and Arnulphus, bishop of Orleans, set forth the object of the council, viz., to decide whether Arnulphus of Rheims were guilty of high treason; proofs were then brought forward to establish his guilt. Arnulphus of Rheims was, on his side defended by three distinguished men, John of Auxerre, Ranulphus, abbot of Sens, and Ebbo of Fleuri, who produced extracts from the false letters of the African bishops to pope Damasus, and from some false decretals, to show that the judgments of bishops ought to be reserved for the pope.

Arnulphus of Orleans then spoke, saying, amongst other things, that the Church of Rome was ever to be held in honour on account of S. Peter, and that the decrees of the pope should always be received when they were not contrary to the canons; "if," said he, "any one pretends with Gelasius, that the Church of Rome is judge of all, whilst she is judged of none, let him place at Rome a pope whose judgment cannot err." He then proceeded to show that even Rome herself had approved that bishops, when accused, should be judged on the spot, without reference to the holy see; that the primitive rule and custom had been broken in upon by false decretals; that he advocated deference to the pope by consulting him; "but," said he, "if his judgment be not just, let us obey the apostle, and not listen even to an angel speaking contrary to the gospel."

Finally it was decided that the council possessed the power of judging in the matter; whereupon Arnulphus was introduced, and his accusation read over to him; in reply, he made a weak defence, and after a short time confessed his guilt, and desired to renounce the episcopate.

In the second session, the two kings, Hugo and Robert, were present; Arnulphus of Rheims knelt before them, and delivered up his ring and pastoral staff; he then read the act renouncing his episcopal office, and declaring that for his sins he was unworthy of the episcopate. After this, Gerbert was elected in his room (subsequently pope Silvester II.)—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 738.

RHEIMS. Held October 3rd, 1049, by pope Leo IX., who presided over twenty bishops, nearly Rheims, 1049.

fifty abbots, and many other ecclesiastics [2]. In the first session, the abuses which had led to the convocation of the council were detailed, viz. simony, usurpations, and persecution of churches by the laity, incestuous marriages, the apostasy of monks and clerks, the pillage of the poor, and other crimes. All the bishops except four, and the archbishop of Rheims, cleared themselves of the charge of simony; the abbots did the same, with a few exceptions.

In the second session several confessed the sin of simony, and they, with others, were condemned. Certain bishops, who having been cited to the council, neither attended nor sent their excuses, were excommunicated; afterwards twelve canons were published.

1. Enacts that no one shall be raised to any bishopric but by the vote of the clergy and people.

2. Forbids simony.

5. Forbids any fee for burial, baptism, and the holy eucharist.

7. Forbids usury.

8. Forbids the clergy and monks to quit their state.

10. Forbids to harass the poor.

12. Forbids to leave a lawful wife in order to marry another.—*See Baron.* A. D. 1049, xvii. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1028.

Rheims, 1094. RHEIMS. Held in 1094, composed of three archbishops and eight bishops. King Philip hoped in this council to have had his marriage with Bertrade approved, his wife Bertha being dead. Ivo, bishop of Chartres, who strenuously opposed the marriage, absolutely refused to attend, and appealed to the pope, declaring that the king might do what he pleased to him, but that he would suffer any thing for the law of God.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 497.

Rheims, 1115. RHEIMS. Held in 1115, by Conon, the Roman legate. S. Godfroi, bishop of Amiens, was brought before the council from his retreat amongst the Carthusians, so worn out by fastings and mortifications, that he could scarcely stand; he was rebuked by the legate for deserting his see, and sent back there. (See C. of Soissons, 1115.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 801.

[2] Dudocus, bishop of Bath (?); Wulfricus, abbot of S. Augustine, and the abbot Olfwinus, were sent by Edward the Confessor to this council, to report to him the proceedings.

RHEIMS. Held from the 20th to the 30th of October, 1119, by pope Calixtus II., who presided over thirteen archbishops [3] and more than two hundred bishops, convoked from all the provinces of the West. Besides the prelates, there were present a very large number of abbots, and Louis VI., king of France. After mass, the pope seated himself upon a raised throne opposite to the door of the church, and when the litany and prayers were finished, delivered a Latin homily upon the Gospel. Then the bishop of Ostia explained to the assembly the various matters upon which they had been called together to deliberate. First, Louis le Gros complained of the violent seizure of Normandy by the king of England; but the council refused to judge the question. Rheims, 1119.

Then Hildegarde, countess of Poictiers, followed by her ladies, brought forward a complaint against William, duke of Aquitaine, who had deserted her, in order to take in her place the wife of the viscount de Châtelleraut, and had plunged into every kind of debauchery. The excuses of the prelates of Aquitaine were received, who alleged that their duke, from illness, was unable to obey the pope's mandate and to attend the council. A delay was granted to him, within which to present himself at Rome and to take back his lawful wife.

After this the archbishop of Lyons complained, in behalf of the bishop of Maçon, of the conduct of Pontius, the abbot of Clugny, against whom many other clerks and monks brought great complaints of his extortions and violence. The abbot of Clugny defended himself, and declared that all the charges brought against him arose simply from his care to preserve inviolate the property and privileges of his monastery.

Five canons were published.

1. Against simony.

[3] Ordericus Vitalis asserts that there were fifteen archbishops present. Amongst them was Thurston, archbishop of York, (elected in 1115, but not yet consecrated,) who obtained king Henry's permission to attend, upon a promise that he would not receive consecration at the hands of the pope, which the king considered as an infringement of the privileges of the metropolitan of Canterbury. When there, however, Thurston forgot his promise, and was consecrated by Calixtus. The pope and Henry, soon after the council, had a conference at Grison, when the pope promised that all the customs of the kingdom of England existing in the time of William Rufus, should be observed. Thurston himself was banished for upwards of a year.

2. Forbids investitures at the hands of laymen.

4. Forbids any fee for burial or sacrament.

5. Forbids priests, deacons, or sub-deacons to have wives or to keep mistresses.

In the last session all the bishops and abbots, to the number of four hundred and twenty-seven, each holding a taper in his hand, rose up, and the pope solemnly excommunicated certain persons, amongst whom were the emperor and the anti-pope, Burdinus.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 862.

Rheims, 1131.

RHEIMS. Held October 18, 1131, by pope Innocentius II., who presided, at the head of thirteen archbishops and two hundred and sixty-three bishops, besides abbots, clerks, and monks from France, Spain, England, and Germany; amongst the abbots present was S. Bernard. The king and queen and nearly all the nobility of France also attended.

The election of pope Innocentius was here confirmed, and Peter of Leon (Anacletus) excommunicated; also Louis, the son of Louis VI. was consecrated by the pope. Seventeen canons [4] were published, one of which forbids monks and regular canons to study civil law or medicine as a profession; another forbids risking life and limb at tournaments; another anathematizes every person striking an ecclesiastic.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 989, misprinted for 979.

Rheims, 1148.

RHEIMS. Held in 1148. Pope Eugenius III. presiding, assisted by several cardinals and bishops from France, Germany, England [5], and Spain. S. Bernard compelled Gilbert de la Porée, bishop of Poictiers, to confess that he had taught that the Divine Nature, which is called the Divinity, is not God, that one only God is not the Three Persons, nor the Three Persons one only God. The holy abbot vigorously attacked this doctrine, and drew up a profession of faith opposing the errors of Gilbert, which was approved by the council; in substance it was as follows:—

1. We believe that the simple nature of the Divinity is God, and that God is the Divinity: that He is wise

[4] Mansi thinks that these seventeen canons are not strictly those of Rheims, but are a collection of the canons made at the two councils held by Innocentius in France, viz. Clermont and Rheims.

[5] Theodore of Canterbury, in spite of the king's prohibition, attended, and the three bishops whom the latter had sent to excuse the attendance of the others.

by that wisdom which is himself; great by that greatness which is himself, &c. Rheims, 1148.

2. When we speak of three Divine Persons, we confess that they are one God and one divine substance; and, on the other hand, when we speak of one God, one divine substance, we say that it is Three Persons.

3. We believe and say that God alone, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is eternal, and that there is no other thing, whether we call it relation, or property, or any thing else, which can be eternal without being God.

4. We believe that the Divinity itself, the Divine Nature, or the Divine Substance, is incarnate, but in the Son.

As several members of the council, including the cardinals present, were in favour of Gilbert, the pope did not confirm the judgment of the council against him by a solemn decree, but only obliged him to retract his errors, and forbad any to read his book until it had been so corrected. His recantation appears to have been sincere.

In this same council, a fanatic, an Englishman, called "Eon of the Star," was brought forward, who had led astray vast multitudes, publishing that it was he who should judge the quick and the dead, alleging as a proof these words of the Church exorcism: "Per eum qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos," &c.; the first two words of which were often badly pronounced, thus, "per eon." He was sentenced to be imprisoned, and soon after died. Many of his disciples preferred being burnt to death to recanting.

In the same assembly an accusation was brought against William, archbishop of York, that he had been neither canonically elected nor lawfully consecrated, but intruded into the see by the king's authority. He was convicted, and Albert, bishop of Ostia, pronounced against him, in the name of the pope, sentence of deposition, alleging that before his election he had been nominated by king Stephen. However, this sentence was passed contrary to the advice of many.

Eighteen canons were published in this council, most of them being but renewals of those made in previous councils. 10. Forbids to commit any church to the care of a hired priest instead of its own priest, and insists that every church shall have its own priest. 12. For-

bids tournaments. (See C. of PARIS.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1107.

Rheims, 1164. RHEIMS. Held in 1164, by pope Alexander III., for the crusade. The abbot Conon coming late into council in his ecclesiastical vestments, and finding no seat, sat down upon the ground, which the pope seeing, and delighted with his humility, sent to him the seat upon which he was himself accustomed to sit. A tax upon all the nobility and clergy for four years was agreed to.—*Pagi*, note. *Baron*, A.D. 1164.

Rheims, 1287. RHEIMS. Held October 1, 1287, by Peter Barbet, the archbishop, with seven of his suffragans, and the deputies of two others, who unanimously agreed to send a deputation to Rome, to proceed to the utmost with their cause against the friars of S. Dominic and S. Francis, in the matter of their privileges of hearing confessions and preaching, granted to them by Martin IV. —Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1317.

Rheims, 1564. RHEIMS. Held in 1564, by cardinal Charles of Lorraine. The bishops of Senlis, Soissons, and Chalons-sur-Marne, were present, with the archbishop of Sens, and the bishop of Verdun, who at the same time were in Rheims, and took part in the deliberations. Besides these prelates, the proctors of the bishops of Noyon, Laon, Amiens, and Boulogne attended. The deputies of chapters and the abbots who were present, had the right of voting given to them. Nineteen congregations were held. In the second it was agreed that the question of the reformation of morals should be delayed until the next council, and that each bishop should, in the mean time, examine closely into the state of his diocese, and see what reform was necessary. Nineteen of the canons made in this council are printed.

1. Orders residence.

2. Warns all curates to preach the Word of God at least on every Sunday and festival: orders them to keep by them a copy of the Tridentine acts in French and Latin, and to conform their teaching to that standard.

3. Directs that curates shall take care to instruct the faithful in the virtue of the sacraments to give remission of sin, lest they should receive them to their damnation.

4. Directs that they shall instruct them in the spiritual benefits of holy baptism.

7. Directs that in the annual diocesan synod six learned men should be named to examine persons to be instituted to benefices.

8. Enjoins great care in the proof of those to be ordained.

10 and 11. Relate to the re-establishment of the minor order of clerks.

18. Relates to archidiaconal visitations, and to the duties of rural deans.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 43.

RHEIMS. Held in 1583, by Louis, cardinal of Guise, archbishop of Rheims, assisted by the bishops of Soissons, Laon, Beauvais, Chalons-sur-Marne, Noyon, and Amiens, and the deputy of the bishops of Senlis. The following subjects were discussed: Divine service, the Breviary, Missal, and Ritual; festival days; the sacraments, seminaries, burials, curates, chapters, simony, usury, episcopal visitations, diocesan synods: these several matters were treated of in five congregations, and thirty regulations drawn up, which were approved by a brief of Gregory XIII. July 30th, 1584. —Tom. xv. Conc. p. 884. Rheims, 1583.

RIEZ. [*Concilium Regense*, or *Regiense*.] Held November 29th, 439, by S. Hilary of Arles, at the head of about twelve bishops. The object of the council was to examine into the circumstances attending the consecration of Armentarius, a young man of quality, who had been elected to the see of Embrun contrary to the canons. A party, composed of laymen, had nominated him without the consent of the metropolitan, and had obtained his consecration by *two* bishops only, although the canons insist on *three*. Riez, 439.

The decision of the council, with regard to the consecrating bishops, was that they should be pardoned, although they had merited to be deposed; but that they should be thenceforth for ever excluded from assisting at any episcopal consecration, and at the provincial synods.

The consecration of Armentarius was declared to be invalid, and it was settled that he should be treated as the fathers of Nicea had determined with regard to the Novatians, *i. e.* that it should be open to any bishop who desired it to give him a district either in the capacity of chor-episcopus, or to assist at service there, and take part in the holy communion as a foreign bishop: that he was incapable of managing more than one

parish, or of ordaining even to the lowest order (although both were frequently done by the chor-episcopi), or of performing any strictly episcopal function, except confirmation and the consecration of virgins, and that in his own church only. In all eight canons were published.

1. Contains the sentence against the two consecrating bishops, and agrees with that made in the council of Turin.

2. Declares the invalidity of the consecration of Armentarius, &c., as above.

3. Relates to Armentarius as above.

4. Relates to the ordinations made by Armentarius, and gives permission to the actual bishop of Embrun, either to employ them in his own diocese or to send them with Armentarius.

5. Gives to Armentarius permission to consecrate virgins, &c.

6 and 7. Forbid any clerk to enter a vacant see, except it be the nearest bishop, for the sake of setting things in order, and require him to leave the city within seven days after the death of the bishop.

8. Renews the fifth council of Nicea concerning the holding of two provincial councils in each year.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1289.

Riga, 1428. RIGA. [*Concilium Rigense.*] Held in 1428, by Henry, archbishop of Riga. From this council sixteen priests were sent as deputies to Rome, to make complaint against the oppressors of the Church of Riga, most probably the Teutonic knights. These unhappy men were, however, seized upon the confines of Livonia by the governor of the fort of Goswin, a knight of the Teutonic order, who caused them to be tied hand and foot and cast into a frozen river, where they were drowned: none of the acts of this council, relating to the state of the Church, are known.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 405.

Rome, 196. ROME. [*Concilium Romanum.*] Held in 196, by Victor, and fourteen other bishops, in order to fix the period for the celebration of Easter on the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the moon. Several councils were held in different parts of the world in this year upon the same subject; as the council of Cesarea, Pontus, Corinth, Osroen, Lyons.

197. In another council, held at Rome in the following

year, Victor desired to excommunicate the Asiatic quartodecimani, which drew from several bishops, especially from S. Irenæus, strong remonstrances.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 596.

ROME. Held in October, 251, by Cornelius, upon the case of the relapsed: about sixty bishops attended, many of whom were confessors; a large number of priests and deacons were also present. They decided that the relapsed might be reconciled, following the opinion of the African Church, which was that they might be admitted to communion after a long course of penance, and even before the expiration of that penance if they were in danger of death. They also decided that Novatian, and all the followers of his inhuman opinions, should be regarded as enemies of the Church, and cut off from it. Rome, 251.

[6] The penitential canons of the first council of Carthage were confirmed.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 715. *Pagi in Bar.* A.D. 254, note 25.

ROME. Held October 2nd, 313, upon the schism of the Donatists, and the affair of Cecilianus, bishop of Carthage. This council was convoked by order of the emperor Constantine, and was held in the palace of the empress Fausta: the pope Miltiades (or Melchiades) presided, at the head of nineteen bishops. Cecilianus was present with his accusers, amongst whom was Donatus. The latter was convicted of having caused a schism at Carthage, at a time when Cecilianus was deacon only, of having re-baptized several persons, and of having given imposition of hands a second time in the case of certain bishops who had relapsed in the persecutions. Donatus finding the proof of these things established against himself, quitted the assembly and did not again appear, upon which the other accusers of Cecilianus dropped their charge against him. Rome, 313.

In the second session the charge brought against Cecilianus was examined into and proved to be utterly groundless. The decision of the council of Carthage in 311 (at which seventy Numidian bishops assembled, Tigesius had deposed Cecilianus and elected Majorinus in his stead), was declared to be of no use, since Cecilianus had been condemned in his absence, not having been able to attend through fear of violence.

[6] These canons are stated by Labbe to have been confirmed in another council held shortly before this at Rome.

In the third session Cecilianus was declared to be innocent, and his consecration was approved. Donatus was condemned as the author of all the mischief. The bishops who had condemned Cecilianus, and those who had come to Rome to accuse him, were, nevertheless, not separated from the Roman communion, since nothing had been proved against them.

The council further ruled that those bishops who had been consecrated by Majorinus should be permitted to retain their sees; and, moreover, that in places where there were two bishops, one consecrated by Majorinus, and the other by Cecilianus, the bishop of longest standing should retain the see, and the other be appointed to some other bishopric. This, as Fleuri observes, is a singular instance of the exercise of a dispensing power; moderating the rigour of the law for the sake of peace.

The acts of this council were sent to the emperor Constantine.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 1401.

Rome, 342. ROME. Held in 342, by pope Julius I., who presided at the head of fifty bishops. The object of the council was to judge the cause of S. Athanasius and others, who had come to Rome to complain of the conduct of the Eusebians. According to Tillemont, it is probable that Hosius of Cordova and Vincentius of Capua were amongst the complainants.

Julius had summoned the Eusebians both to make good their charge against Athanasius, and to defend themselves from the accusations brought against them by Marcellus of Ancyra; they, however, did not think good to appear, which strengthened the suspicions against them. Great attention was paid by the council to the synodal letter of the council of Alexandria, A. D. 340, in defence of S. Athanasius, which, when taken in conjunction with the testimony of several other bishops, to the fact that Arsenius was then living[7], showed clearly the falsehood of one of the chief heads of accusation. In short, the whole of the proceedings in the council of Tyre were declared to be unjust and irregular. S. Athanasius was pronounced to be innocent, and was confirmed in the communion of the Church as a lawful bishop. Then the cause of Marcellus of Ancyra was examined, together with the pro-

[7] The Eusebians and Meletians charged Athanasius with having killed him.

fession of faith which he had made in his letter to the pope. The council declared itself satisfied on this head, and pronounced his condemnation and deposition to be invalid. Julius wrote a long epistle upon these subjects to the orientals, exhorting them to reform their conduct.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 598. *Pagius in Bar.* A.D. 342, note iii.

ROME. Held in 366, against Ursaces and Valens, under pope Damasus, and attended by several bishops. Damasus applied himself earnestly to recover those who had fallen into Arianism, and to discover the authors and heads of that heresy. The creed of Nicea was confirmed. All the proceedings of the council of Ariminum were annulled, and decreed to be utterly void; and Ursaces and Valens were excommunicated with their followers. Rome, 366.

A letter was written to the African prelates, imploring them to preserve episcopal unity, and not to give heed to those who upheld the council of Ariminum to the prejudice of that of Nicea.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 886. *Pagius in Bar.* A. D. 369, note v.

ROME. Held in 372, under the same pope. Ninety-three bishops assembled, and excommunicated Auxentius of Milan; and also discussed the question of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 888. Rome, 372.

ROME. Held in 374 or 375, by pope Damasus, against the Apollinarians, a sect originating with Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, in Syria. The distinguishing point of this heresy was the notion that our Lord Jesus Christ took unto Himself the human *body* only, without the reasonable soul, and that his Divinity supplied the place of the soul. Afterwards, distinguishing the animal soul by which we live from the reasoning intellect, they allowed that our Lord possessed the former. The grounds which they alleged for denying our Lord to be perfect man were these. Rome, 374.

1. Because in that case He would have been sinful like ourselves.

2. Because two perfect things cannot make one only thing.

3. Because the Divinity would, in that case, have been only a *part* of a whole; so that it would have been necessary to acknowledge two Sons and two Christs.

Subsequently the errors of these heretics were carried much further; for as they would not confess two substances and two natures in Jesus Christ, they maintained that He had but one nature, that the Divine and human natures were mixed, his flesh being consubstantial with the Divinity; that a *part* of the Word had been converted into flesh and bones, into a Body having the outward form and appearance of our bodies, but no other resemblance, a Body co-eternal with the Divine nature, and formed out of the Substance of the Eternal Wisdom; and that, accordingly, it was the Divinity of the Son consubstantial with the Father that was circumcised and nailed to the cross, and not a human body like our own. From which they inferred that the Substance of his Body was not taken from the Virgin Mary, but that she was merely the channel by which He entered into the world; accordingly they refused to her the title of mother of God, saying that his Body existed before Mary; that it was, indeed, from all eternity, and was both celestial and uncreated.

Besides these errors upon the subject of the Incarnation, they were heretical in their belief in the blessed Trinity, putting a difference between the Three Persons, calling the Holy Spirit great, the Son greater, and the Father the greatest. They also held the opinions of the Millenarians, and believed in three resurrections.

All these several errors were condemned in this council, as were also Apollinaris and Timotheus[8].

Another upon the same subject, 378.

S. Basil vehemently opposed the spread of this heresy, and in consequence of his letters upon the subject, Damasus convoked another council to Rome in 378, when the errors of Apollinaris and many other heretics were condemned. The Apollinarian heresy was also condemned at Antioch, A. D. 380, and in the œcumenical council of Constantinople, 381. Apollinaris himself persisted in his errors, and died at an advanced age in the reign of Theodosius.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 896. *Pagius in Baron.* A. D. 373, note ii.; A. D. 378, note xiv.

Rome, 382.

ROME. Held in 382, under pope Damasus, in consequence of the schism in the Church of Antioch. Besides Damasus there were present S. Ambrose,

[8] Peter of Alexandria, who had been driven from his see by the troubles of the times, and was sojourning at Rome, was present in this council.

S. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in Cyprus, and Paulinus, recognized by the orientals as bishop of Antioch. The assembly appears to have been numerous, but nothing certain is known of what passed, except that a synodal letter was received from the oriental bishops assembled in council at Constantinople, excusing themselves from attending the Roman council. It is supposed that Paulinus was confirmed in the communion of the Church, and that it was resolved to refuse communion to Flavianus, as well as to Diodorus of Tarsus and Aracius of Berea, who were the authors of his election.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1013.

ROME. Held in 386, under pope Siricius; eighty bishops attended. A letter to the bishops throughout Africa was drawn up (in the name of Siricius only). It related to the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline in the African Church, and contained nine regulations or canons. Rome, 386.

1. Forbids the consecration of a bishop without the knowledge of the patriarch of Rome.

2. Forbids the consecration of a bishop by one bishop only.

3. Forbids to admit to holy orders a man who, after remission of sins (holy baptism), has carried the sword in worldly warfare.

4. Forbids a clerk to marry a widow.

9. Deprives of communion those amongst the priests and deacons who, having received holy orders after marriage, continue to have commerce with their wives. —Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1028 and 1035.

ROME. Held by the same pope, in 390, against Jovinianus, who taught that they who have been baptized, believing, could not be overcome by the devil, and that virgins have no higher merit than widows; he also denied that the blessed Virgin continued a virgin after the birth of Jesus Christ. This council is not found in the collection of Labbe, and is possibly the same with that held at Milan in this year (which see). Rome, 390.

ROME. Held about 402, under Innocentius I. Sixteen canons were drawn up, addressed to the Gallic bishops, in answer to certain questions proposed by them. Rome, 402.

1. Enjoins many years of penitence to those who, after having made a vow of chastity, or taken the veil, marry.

2. Deprives of communion for a time those who break a resolution made to the above effect, although they have made no vow.

4. Excludes from holy orders persons who, after their baptism, have served in war.

6. Declares that as there is but one faith in the Catholic Church, so should there be but one order of discipline.

7. Allows both priests and deacons to baptize at Easter in the presence of the bishop. If it shall be necessary to baptize at any other time, the priest alone may officiate.

9. Forbids to marry a brother's widow, and to keep concubines with a wife.

12. Orders that clerks only shall be made bishops.

13. Deprives of the episcopate bishops who leave their first church.

14. Forbids to receive even to lay communion a clerk driven from his own church by his bishop.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1316.

Rome, 417. ROME. Held in January, 417, by Innocentius I., who had received three letters from Africa against the heretics Pelagius and Celestius. Three synodal letters were written in reply. 1. To Aurelius and the bishops of Carthage. 2. To Silvanus and the bishops of Milevi. 3. To the five bishops, Aurelius, Alipius, Augustine, Evodius, and Possidius.

In September in the same year, another council was held in the Basilica of S. Clement, by Zosimus against Celestius. See C. Milevi, 416.—Tom. ii. Conc. pp. 1283—1290. *Marca*, l. 7, *de Concor.* c. 12, No. 5.

Rome, 430. ROME. Held August 11, 430, by pope Celestinus, against Nestorius. It is not known what bishops attended, but their decrees passed as the decrees of the whole Western Church. In this council the homilies and letters of Nestorius were read, the bishops unanimously crying out against his heretical opinions as they heard them. The two letters of S. Cyril were approved, and declared to be orthodox. Celestinus then delivered a discourse, tending to prove from the fathers that the blessed Virgin is truly Θεοτόκος, the mother of God. The decision of the council was, that they who denied this faith, should be deposed from the ministry.

The decrees of the council were dictated by the pope, who also wrote, as to other bishops, so to Nestorius and to S. Cyril, declaring that the two letters which Nestorius had already received from S. Cyril should be reckoned as two monitions, and the present letter from himself as the third; that if within ten days after receiving the last, he did not openly, and without equivocation, declare his assent to the faith as taught by the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, and by the whole Catholic Church, and also condemn his own new doctrine, he should be thenceforth separated from the communion of the Church, and deprived of the powers and dignity of the priesthood. Celestinus further insisted that he should condemn what he had hitherto believed, and teach the doctrine of S. Cyril; that his followers should either renounce his errors in writing, or be separated from communion; and, moreover, that if he did not afford a proof of the sincerity of his amendment, after condemning his errors, by receiving back into the Church all those whom he had deprived of communion, he should be himself cut off from it. The pope left it to S. Cyril to notify this sentence to Nestorius and the others.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1688.

ROME. Held in 445, under S. Leo. In this council Chelidonius, who had been deposed in the council of Besançon[9] (C. Vesontionense, 444), was restored, and S. Hilary of Arles was deprived of communion with the Roman see. Condemnation was also pronounced against those who, lifted up with pride, despised the assemblies of the Church.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1463. Rome, 445.

ROME. Held in October, 449, under S. Leo; at which a large number of bishops were present. All that had passed in the Latrocinium at Ephesus was condemned, and several synodical letters were written. In that to the emperor Theodosius, Leo complained of the violence of Dioscorus, and of the irregularity of the assembly at Ephesus, and entreated him to convoke an œcumenical council to some place in Italy, as the best Rome, 449.

[9] A council was held at some place in Gaul, probably Besançon, in which S. Hilary and S. Germanus of Auxerre deposed Chelidonius, bishop of Besançon. (Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1461.) S. Hilary strenuously defended his right as metropolitan against the papal encroachments, denying the pope's assumed right of judging the appeal of Chelidonius.

means of settling the disputes relating to the faith.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1475.

Rome, 465. ROME. Held in 465, by the bishops, who had come to Rome to celebrate the anniversary of the consecration of Hilary or Hilarus to the popedom. They numbered about forty-four (Labbe, forty-eight), of whom two came from Gaul, viz. Ingenius of Embrun and Saturnus of Avignon; the others belonged to the vicariat of Rome. Five canons were published.

1. Orders that the canons of Nicea and the decrees of the apostolic see be observed.

2. Forbids to admit to holy orders men who have been married twice, or who have married any women except virgins.

3. Also forbids to admit to holy orders illiterate or maimed persons, and those who have done public penance.

5. Relates to the case of Ireneus, whom Nondinarius, bishop of Barcelona, at his death had appointed his successor. By this canon such transactions were entirely forbidden.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1060.

Rome, 484. ROME. Held in July, 484, by Felix III., according to Baronius, or, as others designate him, Felix II., who presided at the head of sixty-seven bishops. Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, was here condemned, who had caused much evil to the Church by his connexion with the heretics. Amongst other things, he it was who had induced the emperor Zeno to publish the "Henoticon" (or decree of union) in 482. This formulary was intended to reunite all those who were out of the Church, and was filled with those propositions which both Catholics and heretics confessed equally; and although it did not actually contain the heresy of Eutyches, it at least did not condemn it, but rather favoured it, by destroying the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and by opening the door to Church communion to the Eutychians.

This decree caused a fearful schism in the Church, a number of bishops being driven from their sees for refusing to sign it.

Besides this, Acacius had embraced the communion of Peter Moggus or Mongus, an Eutychian, who had been schismatically intruded into the see of Alexandria, and maintained there by an imperial edict, A.D. 482.

After the council had received proof of the guilt of

Acacius, he was deposed and anathematized, with Peter of Alexandria. At the same time the legates of the Roman see, Vitalis and Misenius, whom Acacius had induced to communicate with Mongus, and who had generally favoured Acacius and his party, were excommunicated. The sentence of condemnation, although signed by sixty-seven bishops, runs in the name of the pope only.

The act of condemnation was contained in a letter addressed to Acacius, reproaching him for having consecrated John to the see of Tyre, and ordained Elimerus priest; it then alludes to the affair of Peter Mongus and to the treatment of the Roman legates; and, finally, declares him to be deposed from the episcopate, deprived of Catholic communion, and cut off from the body of the faithful. Concluding thus: "Know then that you have no longer either the power or the name of a bishop; that you have been degraded by the sentence of the Holy Spirit, and condemned by apostolical authority, and that nothing can ever deliver you from the bond of this anathema."

Besides this, Felix procured another act to be passed, depriving Acacius of the sacerdotal dignity, on account of the contempt he had evinced towards the pope, in disregarding his two monitions, and of his having imprisoned the pope in the persons of his two legates; declaring also, that if any bishop, or other ecclesiastic, monk, or layman should communicate with him, he should fall under the same anathema, "Sancto Spiriter exequente."

This sentence was mainly the cause of the long schism, which separated the two Churches for thirty-five years. Acacius, upon receiving it, erased the name of Felix from the sacred Diptyche [1].—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1123.

ROME. Held in March 487, under Felix III., in the Basilica of Constantine, upon the subject of the restoration of those who had relapsed in Africa during Rome, 487.

[1] According to Labbe, two councils were held at Rome in this matter:—

1. In 483, in which Acacius and Peter Fullo were condemned.
2. In 484, composed of seventy-seven bishops, in which Vitalis and Mesenus were condemned, Acacius and Peter of Alexandria anathematized and deposed, and the condemnation of Fullo repeated.

the persecution of Huneric, king of the Vandals: forty-four (or thirty-eight) bishops and seventy-six priests were present. A letter addressed to the bishops by the pope remains, but the decision of the council is lost. In this letter Felix requires the fulfilment of the following conditions by all penitents:—

Firstly, That they confess their faults: being persuaded that he who deceives others in matters of religion really deceives himself.

Secondly, That they humble themselves and mourn with sincerity, renouncing every delicacy, and persevering in fastings and every other mode of penance prescribed.

After this he descends to particulars: he directs that bishops, priests, and deacons, who have consented to be re-baptized, whether voluntarily, or by reason of the violence of their tortures, shall remain in a state of penance until death, deprived of the privilege of praying with the faithful and even with the catechumens; he permits them only lay communion in the hour of death. With regard to other ecclesiastics, monks, virgins, and lay persons, who having relapsed without compulsion, desire sincerely to return to their duty, he orders that they shall be three years amongst the "audientes," and seven years amongst the penitents, and that they shall remain for two years more praying with the laity, without any oblation. If, however, they have fallen through the violence of torture, he permits that they be admitted to communion by imposition of hands after three years' penance.

With regard to infants, he directs that even they shall not be admitted into Church without penance, but that they shall undergo a course of penance, and receive imposition of hands, in order to be eventually admitted to communion.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1149.

Rome, 495. ROME. Held in 495, under pope Gelasius; fifty-five prelates and fifty-eight priests being present. Misenus, who, as legate, had prevaricated at Constantinople, in 484, (see C. of Rome, 484) presented a petition, imploring mercy on account of his old age. By the pope's direction he entered and bowed down before the council, after which he was restored to the privilege of communion, and to the sacerdotal dignity. Vitalis, the other legate, died some time before.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1269.

ROME. Held in the following year[2] under the same pope; seventy-two bishops being present. According to some Romish writers, a catalogue of the books of Holy Scripture was drawn up, agreeing with that now received in the Church of Rome, and in which, after the inspired books, the council declared that the Church received the four œcumenical councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, together with the councils which the fathers had authorized; then the works of SS. Cyprian, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzen, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerome, and Prosper, and Theophilus of Alexandria, and the letter of S. Leo to Flavianus, &c. Amongst the apocryphal works are reckoned those of Faustus of Riez, and Cassianus[3]. Rome, 496.

The distinction between the ecclesiastical and secular powers was also defined in this council by Gelasius, and in these words:—"The emperor has not the title of pontiff, nor the pontiff the regal dignity; God hath separated the functions of the two powers, so that Christian princes have need of the pontiffs to obtain eternal life, and it is the duty of pontiffs to obey the imperial ordinances in all things temporal."—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1260.

ROME. Held March 1, 499, by pope Symmachus, who had just been elected to the papal chair. Seventy-two bishops and many priests attended. The object of the council was to devise means for putting an end to the intrigues of the bishops, and the popular com- Rome, 499.

[2] According to Labbe, this Council was held in the year 494. The number of bishops present was seventy.

[3] This decree concerning the apocryphal books, &c., is regarded by Cave and others as a mere fabrication; indeed, Baluze states that it was never quoted before the ninth century; and that in some MSS. it is spoken of under the name of Damasus, in others under that of Hormisdas; and that Gennadius, S. Isidore, Sigebert, and Honorius of Autun, make no mention of it.

"In spite of these reasons," says the writer quoted below, "it has always been believed that Gelasius, or at least some one of his successors in the sixth century, is the author of the *substance* of this decree, *to which something may perhaps have been added subsequently.*"—*M. Richard, Dictionnaire Universel, &c.*

Pagi allows that Romanists do not agree among themselves as to the authority of this decree, or as to the year of its publication, and that different MSS. assign it variously to Damasus, Gelasius, and Hormisdas. I have followed his authority in assigning this council to the year 496. By Baronius and the Collectors of the Councils, the date given is 494.

motions to which the papal elections gave rise. Five decrees were published.

3. Enacts that any priest, deacon, or other clerk found guilty of having canvassed for, or promised, a vote in the election to the papacy, during the lifetime of the existing pope, shall be deposed and excommunicated.

4. Declares that when the pope shall die suddenly, without having had opportunity of providing for the election of a successor, the bishop who shall have the majority of the votes shall be consecrated pope.

5. Not only pardons but orders a reward to any accomplice who shall betray an act of bribery or intrigue relating to the election. — Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1312.

Rome, 501. ROME. Held in 501, and called the "Synodus Palmaris," probably from the place at which it was holden. One hundred and fifteen bishops had, in the preceding year, declared Symmachus to be guiltless of the accusations preferred against him before king Theodoric, by the partizans of Laurentius; whereupon the king sent Peter, bishop of Altino, as visitor of the holy see, who convoked this council, wherein it was ordered that the pope should administer the holy communion, and that the faithful should receive at his hands. Seventy-six bishops subscribed this judgment [4]. — Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1323.

Rome, 502. ROME. Held in 502, by the same pope. The law of Odoacer, forbidding any election to the popedom to be made without the consent of the king of Italy, was abolished. Certain decrees forbidding the alienation of Church property were passed [5].—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1333.

Rome, 531. ROME. Three councils were held at Rome in this year. In the first, pope Bonifacius II. appointed Vigilius, the deacon, his successor.

[4] According to Mansi (note in Bar. ann. 501), Peter of Altino was sent as visitor of the Church of Rome about Easter, 501, and immediately held a council, in which the accusations against Symmachus were produced, but nothing was settled, owing to his refusal to appear before it. Late in the same year, however, another council was held, by the king's order, in which Symmachus was acquitted. Nevertheless, the partizans of Laurentius still fomented the schism in the Church, and did all in their power to prejudice Theodoric against the pope; under these circumstances Symmachus convoked, in 502, this third council, called the S. Palmaris, in which he was a second time entirely exonerated.

[5] According to Binius, this is the "Synodus Palmaris."

In the second, this appointment was annulled by Bonifacius himself, as illegal, and contrary to the canons.

In the third, under the same pope, the affair of Stephen of Larissa, the metropolitan of Thessaly, who had been deposed by Epiphanius of Constantinople, and had appealed to Rome, was debated. The decision of the council is unknown; but many letters and other documents were read, tending to prove that Thessaly belonged to the patriarchate of Rome, and not to that of Constantinople.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1691.

ROME. Held in 534, under pope John II., in which the proposition, "Unus e Trinitate passus est carne," was approved; and the Acœmetian monks, who denied it, were condemned and excommunicated [6]. Rome, 534.

ROME. Held in 590, or in the beginning of 591, in which pope Gregory I. wrote a synodal letter to the four eastern patriarchs, testifying that he received the four œcumenical councils equally with the four gospels, and adding that he paid the like respect to the fifth, as he had before declared in a letter to the bishops of Istria, who refused to admit the fifth. Rome, 590.

ROME. Held July 5th, 595, under pope Gregory I. Twenty-two bishops and thirty-three priests were present, with certain deacons, who remained standing. John, a priest of Chalcedon, who had appealed from the sentence of John, the patriarch of Constantinople, was absolved. Six canons were published. Rome, 595.

1. Orders that in future the ministers of the holy altar shall not chant, but only read, the gospel at the mass, and that the subdeacons or inferior clerks shall chant the Psalms and read whatever else is required.

2. Orders certain clerks or monks to be always about the bishop, to act as secret witnesses of his actions.

4. Forbids the custom then prevalent, of covering the body of a pope, at his funeral, with a dalmatic, in order afterwards to divide it among the people as a relic.

5. Forbids to take money for ordination, for the pall,

[6] The error of these monks consisted in denying that one of the blessed Trinity was made man, and suffered in the flesh; and that the blessed Virgin is truly and properly the mother of God. This notion caused a great commotion in the Oriental Church, which induced the emperor Justinian to send Hypatus, bishop of Ephesus, and Demetrius of Philippi, to Rome, to receive the judgment of that Church upon the matter.

and for letters, under any pretext whatever.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1602.

Rome, 600. ROME. In a council held in the year 600, a certain false monk, named Andrew, a Greek, but living in the Basilica of S. Paul, was condemned. The errors attributed to him, and which he chiefly defended by corrupted extracts from the fathers, were these :—

1. That the body of Christ was impassible and incorruptible.

2. That the body of Adam before the fall was neither mortal nor corruptible.

3. That the world is incorruptible, and will never be destroyed.—*Pagius in Bar.* A.D. 601, xxix. Tom. v. Conc. p. 1609.

Rome, 601. ROME. Held on the 5th of April, 601, under the same pope. In this council, a constitution in favour of the monks was drawn up and signed by twenty bishops, and sixteen cardinal priests. It was thereby forbidden to any bishop to diminish the property, revenue, &c., of any monastery ; it was ordered that the election of the abbot should be made by the free choice of the community, and out of their own body, and that he should have sole rule in his house, &c.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1607.

Rome, 606. ROME. Held in 606, under pope Bonifacius III., assisted by seventy-two bishops, besides priests and deacons. It was forbidden to proceed to the election of any one to the see of Rome until the third day after the funeral of the deceased pope.—*Anastasius, Vita Bonifacii.* Tom. v. Conc. p. 1616.

Rome, 610. ROME. Held 27th of February, 610, by Bonifacius IV. Mellitus, bishop of London, being present, who had applied to the pope upon matters connected with the Church of England: First, for his advice with regard to the opinion of a certain party in England, who denied that monks could exercise the sacerdotal office; this question was decided in favour of the monks. Secondly, for his confirmation of the monastery founded at Canterbury by king Ethelbert, and consecrated by S. Augustine, who had lately died. The pope addressed a letter to the king.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1617. *Holst. Coll. Romana*, p. 242.

Rome, 639. ROME. Held in 639, in which pope Severinus condemned the Ecthesis of Heraclius. (See C. of CONSTANTINOPLE, A.D. 639.)—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1773.

ROME. Held in October, 678, under pope Agatho ; fifty bishops and abbots being present. The object of the council was to consider the case of Wilfred, bishop of York, who was present, and complained of having been unjustly deposed, and of the division of his bishopric into three. The council ordered that he should be re-established in his see and the intruders removed, finding that he had not been canonically convicted of any crime deserving deposition. Upon his return to England with the pope's letter, king Egfrid, instead of yielding to the decision of the Roman council, threw him into prison, whence he was released at the end of nine months, and went into Sussex. At the expiration of ten years, Egfrid being dead, Aldfrid recalled him to his first see; but Wilfred still refused to consent to the division of his bishopric, which had now been divided into four, viz. York, Hexham, Ripon, and Lindisfarne, and was subsequently deposed the second time, by Bertwald, or Brihtwald, of Canterbury ; he again appealed to Rome. (See C. of Rome, A.D. 703.)—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 579. *Johnson*, A.D. 680. Rome, 678.

ROME. Held March 27, 679, pope Agatho presiding at the head of one hundred and twenty-five bishops, amongst whom was Wilfred of York. Deputies were sent to the œcumenical council at Constantinople, who carried with them letters from the pope and from the council to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus ; these two letters are all that remain to us of the acts of this council. In that of the pope, the catholic faith upon the two subjects of the blessed Trinity and the Incarnation is explained, and particularly in all relating to the question concerning the two wills, he says plainly, that the three divine persons, having but one nature, have also but one will ; but that in Jesus Christ there being two natures, there are of necessity two wills. He supports his arguments by passages in the original language from the Greek fathers, and from other passages out of the Latin fathers, translated into Greek. The synodal letter is written in his name and in that of all the western province, and is in substance like that of Agatho.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 584. Rome, 679.

ROME. Held in 703, under pope John VI. The affair of Wilfred of York, who had been a second time deposed, was again debated, deputies being present from Bertwald, archbishop of Canterbury ; during four Rome, 703.

months, seventy congregations were held upon this question, and eventually Wilfred was entirely justified, and sent back by the pope to his church, with a letter from John to Aldfrid, king of Northumbria, and to Ethelred, king of the Mercians, who had become an abbot. These letters had no effect during the lifetime of Aldfrid; but after his death, at the instigation of Bertwald and Ethelred, Wilfred was put in possession of part of his diocese; he died at Oundle, in Mercia, A.D. 709, and was buried at Ripon. (See C. Nid. 705.)

Rome, 721. ROME. Held April 5, 721 (or 722, *Mansi*), under Gregory II.; thirty-two bishops being present. Seventeen canons were published, chiefly relating to unlawful marriages. Thus, any person marrying a woman whose husband had been ordained priest ("presbyteram"), is declared to be anathema, it being forbidden to such a woman to marry even after her husband's death. Also they are condemned who marry a deaconess, a nun, a brother's widow, a niece, a father's or son's widow, &c. The twelfth canon forbids all soothsaying and enchantments. The seventeenth forbids the clergy, under anathema, to wear long hair.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1455.

Rome, 732. ROME. Held in 732, under Gregory III., composed of ninety-three bishops. In this council it was decreed, that whosoever should despise the use of the Church with respect to the veneration of images, or should remove, or destroy, or profane, or speak with contempt of them, should be excommunicated. — Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1485.

Rome, 744. ROME. Held in 744, under pope Zachary; fifteen chapters are extant.

1. Forbids bishops to live in the same houses with women.

2. Forbids priests and deacons to have any women in their houses, except a mother or near relation.

4. Orders bishops, priests, and deacons, to dress themselves properly in a sacerdotal tunic, and to wear a cloak in towns.

5. Anathematizes him who shall marry a nun, or the wife of a priest, deacon, or monk.

6. Forbids marriage within certain degrees.

7. Anathematizes those clerks and monks who let their hair grow long.

9. Forbids to make a festival of New Year's Day as the Pagans did.

11. Directs that the proper season for ordination be observed, viz. in the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months; forbids to admit to holy orders men who have been twice married, or who have married widows.

13. Forbids bishops, priests, and deacons, to carry a stick at the celebration of mass, and to go up to the altar with the head covered.

15. Of marriages.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1546. *Bar.* A.D. 743, xvii.

ROME. Held by pope Zachary, in 745; seven bishops and some priests being present. Deneardus, a deputy from Bonifacius, archbishop of Mayence, complained that Adalbert and Clement, two schismatical and heretical bishops, who had been deposed in the council of Soissons, refused to obey the judgment of the council, and still retained their office and dignity. Adalbert was accused, amongst other things, of having been simoniacally consecrated, of consecrating altars, and erecting chapels and crosses in his diocese in his own name. Clement was an Irishman; he was accused of rejecting the authority of the canons and the writings of the fathers, of endeavouring to retain his office of bishop after having had adulterous children, of permitting a man to marry his brother's wife, &c. Rome, 745.

The writings of Adalbert were ordered to be shut up, and both he and Clement deposed and put to penance. —Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1556.

ROME. Held in 769, under pope Stephen IV. (or according to some III.); twelve French bishops and several others from Tuscany, Campania, and other parts of Italy, being present. The false pope, Constantine, was condemned to perpetual penance, and the acts of the council in which his election had been confirmed were burnt. Besides this, it was ordered that the relics and images of the saints should be duly honoured, according to ancient tradition; and the Greek council, held a short time before, in which the worship of images was condemned, was anathematized. Another decree, passed in this council, forbids the elevation of any layman to the rank of cardinal, except he have first passed through all the ecclesiastical orders. —Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1721. Rome, 769.

ROME. Held in 774, by Charlemagne, who was present, with the pope Hadrian I. and one hundred and fifty-three bishops. In this council Hadrian granted to Rome, 774.

Charlemagne the right of electing the sovereign pontiff, and ordained that the bishops of every province should receive investiture at his hands, forbidding any to be consecrated, under pain of anathema, that were not so invested.

Baronius, Pagi, Marca, and others, maintain that this council is fictitious. Pagi, however, acknowledges that its authenticity is allowed by many even of the Italians. *Pagius in Bar.* A.D. 774, xiii. *Corp. Jur. Canon. Distinct.* 63. c. 22, 23.

Rome, 792. ROME. Held in 792, under Hadrian II., in which Felix d'Urgel, who had been sent to Rome from the council of Ratisbon, held in the same year, confessed his errors and was sent back to his see. Labbe ascribes this council to the pontificate of Leo III., A.D. 799.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1149.

Rome, 826. ROME. Held in 826, by pope Eugenius II.; sixty-three bishops, seventeen priests, and several deacons, being present. Thirty-eight canons were published. Amongst other things, they forbid priests to live in the houses of laymen; order the clerks belonging to a church to dwell together near the church, having a common refectory and dormitory; forbid to ordain priests unnecessarily; order ruined churches to be rebuilt by their possessors, in case of their inability, the people to assist them; forbid the laity during mass to enter that part of the church which is appropriated to the priests; order the erection of schools for the people, &c. 35. Forbids dancing and feasting at church on festival days, and declares that the people should be warned to come for prayer only. 37. Forbids any man to have two wives, or a wife and mistress, at the same time, "quia cum domui non sit lucrum, animæ fit detrimentum."—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 103.

Rome, 848. ROME. Held in 848, under Leo IV., who addressed a synodal letter to the Breton bishops, with six chapters, declaring that no bishop might take any money for conferring holy orders, under pain of deposition, but that their past conduct should be overlooked. (See C. of BRETAGNE, 848.)—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 30.

Rome, 853. ROME. Held in December, 853, under Leo IV., at the head of sixty-seven bishops. The thirty-eight canons made in the council held at Rome in 826, under Eugenius II., were confirmed, and others enacted, making altogether forty-two.

After the other business of the council was ended, Anastasius, a priest-cardinal of S. Marcellus, was deposed, for having, contrary to the canons, deserted his parish for five years; the bishops had been sent to call him to the council.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 113.

ROME. Held in 862, by Nicholas I., against the sect of Theopaschitæ, who maintained that the divine nature of Christ suffered with his human nature.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 738. Rome, 862.

ROME. Held in January, 863, under pope Nicholas I. In it all the proceedings at Constantinople against the patriarch Ignatius, and in favour of Photius, in 861, were condemned. The bishop Zachary, one of the pope's legates, was excommunicated and deposed; the other, Rodoaldus, being absent, his sentence was deferred. In delivering judgment upon what had passed at Constantinople, the council spoke after this manner: that Photius, who adhered to the party of the schismatics, and who had left the warfare of this world in order to be ordained bishop, (which he was by Gregory of Syracuse,) who, in the lifetime of Ignatius, had usurped his see, and entered into the sheepfold as a thief; who had dared in a council to anathematize Ignatius; who had corrupted the legates of the holy see; who had banished those of the bishops who refused to communicate with him; who still persecuted the Church, and did not cease to cause Ignatius to suffer every kind of evil; that this Photius was deprived of all sacerdotal honour, and forbidden to exercise any clerical function, by the authority of Almighty God, of the apostles SS. Peter and Paul, and of all the saints, of the six œcumenical councils[7], and by the judgment of the Holy Spirit delivered through the bishops there present.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 774, and p. 287. Rome, 863.

ROME. Held in 868, under Hadrian II., against Photius of Constantinople, who had condemned pope Nicholas. A decree was made, anathematizing the Constantinopolitan council. Hadrian admitted that Honorius had been anathematized when dead, but denied that any one patriarch or bishop would have had any authority to pronounce sentence upon him unless the decision of the holy see had been first given. After Rome, 868.

[7] It is to be remarked, that *six* œcumenical councils only are recognized in this decree, thereby excluding the second council of Nicea, in 787.

this, Hadrian condemned the writings of Photius to be burnt, and anathematized him. This sentence was subscribed by thirty bishops, amongst whom were Hadrian himself, and John, the legate of Ignatius.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 941.

Rome, 879. ROME. Held in August, 879. The pope, John VIII., in this council resolved to recognize Photius as the patriarch of Constantinople (Ignatius being dead). Cardinal Peter was sent as legate to Constantinople to absolve Photius from the ecclesiastical censures, with an instruction signed by seventeen bishops.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 321.

Rome, 896. ROME. Held in 896 or 897. In this council pope Stephen VI. caused the body of his predecessor, Formosus, which he had disinterred, to be brought forward, and reproached it with having left the bishopric of Porto, in order to usurp that of Rome. Afterwards he condemned the body, stripped it of the sacred vestments with which it was clothed, cut off three fingers and the head, and threw it into the Tiber. At the same time he deposed all those whom Formosus had ordained. Very shortly after Stephen was made to pay the penalty of these horrible iniquities, being driven from his see, thrown into prison, and strangled.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 478.

Rome, 898. ROME. Held in 898, as Pagi has shown, by John IX., who was therein consecrated in the presence of the legates of the emperor Lambert. All the acts of the preceding council were annulled; the bishops whom Stephen had deposed were re-established, whilst Sergius and his companions were condemned, with a prohibition ever to restore them. The election of Lambert was confirmed, and the coronation and consecration of Berengarius were declared null.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 502. *Pagi in Bar.* 898, note iv.

Rome, 963. ROME. Held December 4, 963, by the emperor, Otho I., at the entreaty of the Roman bishops and people, in order to depose John XII., accused of many crimes; in his place was elected Leo VIII., a man of tried merit. The acts of the council are lost.

964. Two councils were held in the following year: in the first of which John XII. deposed Leo VIII.; and in the second Leo, in his turn, deposed Benedict V., elected to succeed John, who had been assassinated. Neither of the councils which recognized Leo are re-

ceived by the Roman Church. — Tom. ix. Conc. pp. 648. 659.

ROME. Held in 993, January 31, for the canonization of S. Uldaric, bishop of Augsburg. The narrative of the miracles worked by him, both when alive and dead, was first read by Lintolf, bishop of Augsburg. This is the first act of canonization known: the bull signed by John XV., five other bishops, nine cardinal-priests, and three deacons, is extant.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 741. Rome, 993.

ROME. Held by pope Gregory V. in 998, assisted by twenty-seven bishops, in the presence of the emperor, Otho III., and of Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna. Eight canons were published; of which the first decrees that king Robert should separate from Bertha, his relation, whom he had married, contrary to the canons, and perform seven years of penance; and the second, that all the bishops assisting or present at the marriage should be excommunicated.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 772. Rome, 998.

ROME. Held in January, 1047, by Clement II., to settle a dispute concerning precedency, which had arisen between the archbishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, all of whom claimed the right of sitting on the pope's right hand. The case was decided in favour of Ravenna. Acts were also passed against simony.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 946. Rome, 1047.

ROME. Held in March, 1049, under Leo IX.; composed of bishops from Gaul and Italy. All simoniacal ordinations were declared to be null and void, and several bishops deposed on that account in the council. As this decision created the most fearful tumult and confusion (scarcely a priest being found to carry on the services of the Church), the pope subsequently adhered to the decree of Clement II., which permitted those who had been simoniacally ordained to exercise the functions of their office after forty days' penance.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1027. Rome, 1049.

ROME. Held in April, 1050, by Leo IX., to whom the case of Berenger had been referred. The council was numerous. The pope caused Berenger's letter to Lanfranc, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, to be read, in which his views concerning the holy Eucharist were developed; he erred in regarding Rome, 1050.

the bread and wine as mere symbols, and in denying the real presence. His sentence was, that he should be deprived of church communion. Lanfranc, who had been suspected of entertaining similar views, cleared himself of the charge to the satisfaction of the pope and council.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1052.

Rome, 1051. ROME. Held after Easter in the year 1051, by Leo IX. Gregory, bishop of Verceil, was excommunicated on account of adultery. He was not present in the council, and subsequently, having promised satisfaction, was allowed to resume the discharge of his episcopal functions. A decree was also made in this council that all women within the walls of Rome prostituting themselves to priests, should in future be adjudged as slaves to the palace of Lateran. This was subsequently extended to other churches.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1066.

Rome, 1057. ROME. Held April 18, 1057. Victor II. excommunicated Guifrad of Narbonne for simony.

In this year several councils were held at Rome by the same pope, to devise means for preventing the marriages of the clergy.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1087.

Rome, 1059. ROME. Held in April, 1059, under Nicholas II., assisted by one hundred and thirteen bishops. A constitution was published concerning the election of the Roman pontiff, which grants to the cardinals the chief voice in the election of the pope; and declares that if any one shall enter upon the papal chair without the unanimous and canonical consent of the cardinals, and that of the other clergy and the laity, he shall not be regarded as pope, but as an intruder.

Also thirteen canons were enacted.

3. Forbids to hear mass celebrated by a priest who keeps a concubine.

6. Forbids priests and other clerks to receive churches at the hands of laymen.

7. Forbids any priest to serve two churches at once.

9. Forbids simony.

10. Forbids laymen to judge clerks.

11. Forbids marriages within seven degrees of consanguinity.

Besides this, a decree against simony was published, and a profession of faith concerning the Eucharist was also made, which Berenger signed with an oath. This

being his third recantation, he nevertheless afterwards wrote against it, and attacked cardinal Humbert, who was the author of it.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1099.

ROME. Held in 1061, by Nicholas II., against those who had been guilty of simony; amongst whom was Aldred of York. He was at first deposed as simoniacal; but having been robbed and plundered on his journey to Rome, he excited so much commiseration by his appearance, that his sin was forgiven, and the pope restored to him his archbishopric and the pall [8]. Rome, 1061.

ROME. Held in 1065, by Alexander II., against incestuous marriages, and against those who maintained the validity of certain marriages contracted within the limits forbidden by the canons.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1181. Rome, 1065.

ROME. Held in Lent, 1074, under Gregory VII., for the reformation of the Church. It was decreed that they who had received holy orders simoniacally, should be deprived. That those who had given money for any benefices should lose them; and that those who continued to live in a state of incontinence, should not be permitted either to celebrate mass, or to discharge any of the inferior offices of the altar. Twenty-four chapters were published [9].—Tom. x. Conc. p. 313. Rome, 1074.

ROME. Held in Lent, 1076, under Gregory VII.; who excommunicated Henry of Germany, anathematized him, deprived him of his kingdom, and absolved all his subjects from their oath of allegiance. This was the first time that such a sentence had been pronounced. Several bishops on this side the Alps were also suspended or excommunicated.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 355. Rome, 1076.

[8] Pagi asserts that the whole story about the accusation of simony is fictitious; but that Aldred, going to Rome to solicit the pall from the pope, was refused, upon the ground that he had been translated from a lesser to a greater see without the pope's consent, and had, moreover, refused to resign the lesser bishopric (Worcester); and that when Aldred and the pope could come to no agreement, the former left Rome, but, being plundered as above, he was compelled to return; and the pope, softened by his misfortunes, granted the pall, and gave him licence to consecrate another to the see of Worcester upon his return to England.

[9] The last two lay down in strong terms the doctrine of the superiority of the pope over all other bishops; states that they are called "*in partem solicitudinis*," not "*in plenitudinem potestatis*;" and that their people are bound to pay fuller obedience to the pope than to their bishops.

Rome, 1078. ROME. Held in Lent, 1078, by Gregory VII.; consisting of about one hundred bishops, besides abbots and other clerks. An immense number of excommunications were pronounced; amongst others, against the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna. It was also determined to send legates into Germany to hold an assembly, in which the claims of Henry and Rodolph might be settled. The latter had been elected to the imperial dignity in 1077 by the princes of Suabia and Saxony, who revolted from Henry when the sentence pronounced against him in the last-mentioned council was published. Henry, however, by the most abject submission, had in some degree propitiated the pope in the preceding year. Four canons were published in this council.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 369.

Rome, 1078. ROME. Another council was held in November in the same year, under Gregory VII. Berenger again made a confession of the faith[1]. Nicephorus, who had gotten possession of the empire of Constantinople, was excommunicated, with several others. The deputies of Henry and Rodolph swore that their masters would do nothing to hinder the conference about to be holden by the legates in Germany. Lastly, twelve canons were published.

7. Forbids to eat meat on Saturdays, except it be a festival.

12. Directs that the faithful shall endeavour to make some offering at mass, according to ancient custom.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 371.

Rome, 1079. ROME. Held in 1079, under pope Gregory VII., composed of one hundred and fifty bishops. The question concerning the holy Eucharist was discussed in the presence of Berenger. Alberic of Montcassin, and S. Bruno, who was shortly after made bishop of Signi, disputed with him; he ultimately confessed his error, in saying that the holy Eucharist is but the *figure* of the Lord's Body and Blood; and he desired to obtain pardon[2]. But no sooner had he returned to France, than

[1] "Profiteor panem Altaris, post consecrationem, esse verum Corpus Christi, quod natum est de Virgine, quod passum est, &c. . . . et vinum Altaris, postquam consecratum est, esse verum sanguinem qui manavit de latere Christi."

[2] His confession on this occasion differed from that made in the previous council in this particular, that he explicitly declared his belief to be, that the bread and wine, after consecration, were

he once more retracted all that he had declared in this council, and even wrote against his own confession. The controversy was still carried on by Lanfranc and Guitmund, who warmly attacked him; but Berenger preserved a profound silence ever after, and soon retired from the world to an island in the neighbourhood of Tours, where he died in 1088.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 378.

ROME. Held by Gregory VII., in 1080, shortly after the battle of Fladenheim, in which Henry was vanquished by Rodolph. Henry was here again excommunicated with his partizans, and his kingdom given to Rodolph. Afterwards a matter in dispute between the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Dol was discussed, the former insisting that Bretagne should recognize the archbishop of Tours as its metropolitan. It was found to be impossible to settle the question. The prohibition to give or receive investitures was renewed.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 381. Rome, 1080.

ROME. Held by Gregory VII., in 1083, during the siege of the city by Henry, king of Germany. Certain rules relating to discipline were drawn up. Excommunication was denounced against all persons hindering the approach of those who desired to enter Rome. Ordinations uncanonically made were declared to be null, and the incontinence of the clergy forbidden. —Tom. x. Conc. p. 401. Rome, 1083.

ROME. Held in 1084, by Gregory VII., who had been compelled to flee to the castle of S. Angelo, upon the approach of the emperor Henry to Rome, of which he took possession March 22, 1084, causing the antipope Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, to be enthroned on Easter Sunday under the style of Clement III. Gregory, in this council, renewed the sentence of excommunication against Guibert, Henry, and all their followers.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 402. Rome, 1084.

ROME. Held in 1099, in the third week after Easter, by Urban II., at the head of one hundred and fifty bishops, amongst whom was Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. Thirteen canons were published, of which the first eleven are taken, word for word, from those of Placenza. The penalty of excommunication Rome, 1099.

substantially ("substantialiter") *converted* into the true body and blood of Christ.

was declared against all laymen who should give investiture, and all ecclesiastics who should receive them at their hand. Every thing approaching to simony was forbidden. All the faithful were directed to fast every Friday for their sins. Moreover, in this synod the anti-pope Guibert was a second time excommunicated. —Tom. x. Conc. p. 615.

Rome, 1144. ROME. Held in 1144, by pope Lucius II.; in which the churches of Bretagne were all submitted to the archbishop of Tours as their metropolitan, with the exception of that of Dol, which, during the lifetime of Geoffrey, the then bishop, it was declared should be subject to the pope only. This difference between the prelates of Tours and Dol was not entirely settled until 1199. See C. Rome, 1080.

Rome, 1227. ROME. Held in 1227, November 18, under Gregory IX., who, in this council, reiterated the excommunication which he had already pronounced against the emperor Frederick, on account of his not having embarked for the Holy Land, according to his vow.

1228. In the following year, in a council held in Lent, the same pope confirmed this sentence; which, however, the emperor made light of, and in the June following he embarked for the Holy Land, in spite of the pope's prohibition to him to assume the character of a crusader until the censures pronounced against him had been removed.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 413.

Rome, 1302. ROME. Held in 1302, under Bonifacius VIII.; who, in this council, made great demonstrations against king Philip le Bel, without, however, putting any of his threats into execution [3]. The famous decretal "Unam Sanctam," was the work of this council. In this bull the pope declares that we are instructed by the holy Gospels, that in the Church and under its authority, are two swords, the spiritual and the temporal; the former to be employed by the Church, the latter for the Church by the hand of the prince, in accordance with the order and permission of the pontiff; and that it is needful that one of these swords be subject to the other, viz. the temporal to the spiritual.

It is necessary, as Fleury remarks, to distinguish carefully between the preamble and the decision contained in this bull. The whole of the preamble tends

[3] Binius says that he was actually excommunicated.

to show that the temporal power is entirely subject to the spiritual, and that the pope possesses the right to institute, correct, and depose princes.

However, Bonifacius, ambitious as he was, did not dare openly to draw this inference, although it flowed naturally from his premises. He, therefore, contented himself with asserting generally that every person whatever is subject to the pope ("Omnem humanam creaturam subesse Romano Pontifici"). See C. PARIS, A.D. 1302.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1476.

ROME. Held in the years 1412—13, by John XXIII. The deputies of the university of Paris, who had come to demand that the Gallican Church should be relieved from the burden of tithes, services, and other assistance which the court of Rome required, were refused a hearing in spite of their entreaties. No other act of the council appears, except the condemnation of the writings of Wickliff.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2322. Rome, 1412, and 1413.

ROME. Held in 1725, under Benedict XIII., upon matters relating to faith, morals, and ecclesiastical discipline. The acts were printed at Rome in 1725, in 4to.; at Brussels, in 12mo., in 1726. Rome, 1725.

ROSCOMMON. Held in 1158, under Edanus, archbishop of Tuam. Various good regulations were drawn up, which are lost.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1184. Roscommon, 1158.

ROUEN. [*Concilium Rothomagense.*] Held in 650. Sixteen canons were published. Rouen, 650.

1. Orders the burning of incense during the reading of the Gospel.

2. Orders that the priest who celebrates mass shall communicate himself.

4. Directs the extermination of magicians, &c.

5. Directs that persons baptized in heresy shall be received by imposition of hands.

12. Orders twenty days' penance for a layman who has shed blood in anger, thirty for a clerk, six months for a deacon, a year for a priest, and two years and six months for a bishop.—*Bessin in Conciliis Normanniæ.*

ROUEN. Held in 1049, Maugier (or Malgerius), archbishop of Rouen, presiding; who drew up a synodal letter addressed to the bishops and the faithful within his province, containing the following nineteen regulations:— Rouen, 1049.

1. That they should hold fast the creed of the Catholic and Apostolic Church.

2. That the clergy should, on no account, give presents, &c., to princes, or to their officers, in order to obtain bishoprics.

3. That bishops should not go from one see to another from ambitious motives.

4. That monks should, on no account, appoint any person abbot on consideration of money given to them.

5. That no bishop or abbot should dispossess another.

6. That bishops should receive nothing on account of ordinations.

7. Nor their officers, viz. archdeacons and secretaries.

8. That no one be ordained unless he be of competent age and knowledge.

9. That no bishop should ordain a clerk belonging to another diocese, without permission of the bishop of that diocese.

10. That bishops should not give ecclesiastical lands or revenues to lay-persons.

11, 12, 13. That ecclesiastics should not endeavour to supplant one another.

14, 15, 16. That they should exact nothing for the holy chrism, the dedication of churches, or for holy baptism.

17. Relates to the offerings to be made by the newly baptized.

18. Forbids to diminish the prescribed penance on account of money received.

19. Requires the newly baptized to wear the white dress, and carry a lighted taper for eight days in the church of their baptism.—*Bessin, Conc. Norm.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1047.

Rouen, 1072. ROUEN. Held in 1072, in the presence of William the Conqueror, by John de Bayeux, archbishop of Rouen, who presided. Twenty-four canons were published.

1. Orders the bishop to consecrate the holy oil at the proper time, in the presence of twelve priests in their vestments.

4. Forbids a priest to celebrate the communion without communicating himself.

5. Orders that priests shall administer holy baptism fasting, and habited in the alb and stole, unless in cases of necessity.

8. Directs that holy orders shall be conferred on Saturday night or on Sunday morning, the Saturday's fast not having been broken.

15. Declares that priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, by marriage, forfeit all right to their ecclesiastical revenues and are rendered incapable of performing any of the functions of their office, either personally or by deputy.

21. Forbids any one to eat on any day during Lent until the hour of Nones was passed.

23. Directs, that when a festival falls upon a day on which it cannot be celebrated, it shall be kept on the octave below.

24. Restricts the baptism of adults to Easter and Whitsuntide, except in cases of necessity; allows of infant baptism at all times.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1225.

Rouen, 1074.

ROUEN. Held in 1074, by the same archbishop. The cause of assembling this council was a tumult which had happened in the church of S. Ouen in the preceding year. The monks of S. Ouen were condemned. The doctrine of the sacred Trinity was laid down in accordance with the definitions of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. And fourteen canons were published.

1. Condemns the purchase of benefices, and simony of all kinds.

3. Forbids to receive a clerk without letters from his bishop.

7. Enjoins upon monks and nuns the rule of S. Benedict.

9. Declares that Christian burial is not to be denied to those who die suddenly (unless they were in a state of sin), nor to women with child, nor to those who have just been confined.

12. Forbids clerks who have been degraded for their sins to live in the world as laymen.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 310. *Bessin, Conc. Norm.*

Rouen, 1096.

ROUEN. Held in February, 1096; the archbishop William presiding, assisted by his suffragans. The decrees of the council of Clermont, under Urban II., and those of the council of Auvergne, were read and confirmed, and eight canons published.

1, 2, 3, 4. Relate to the Trève de Dieu.

6. Forbids lay-persons to present priests to churches without the bishop's consent, or to sell them. Orders

all men to keep their hair cut short, as becomes Christian men, under pain of excommunication.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 599.

Rouen, 1118. ROUEN. Held in 1118, October 7, by Henry, king of England. Matters concerning the peace of the kingdom were discussed; Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, and other bishops, as well as the lords of the province, being present. One bishop excused himself for his absence on the plea, he was engaged in defending his country against the common foes.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 824.

Rouen, 1190. ROUEN. Held February 11, 1190; Walter, the archbishop (formerly bishop of Lincoln), presiding at the head of all his suffragans, and several abbots. Thirty-two canons were published, most of which are repetitions of those published in preceding councils, amongst others, in the council of Lateran, A.D. 1179.

2. Forbids to consecrate the Eucharist except in vessels of gold or silver, unless with the bishop's consent.

3. Forbids to carry the consecrated host either by day or by night without tapers and the cross, or without the presence of a priest, unless in cases of urgent necessity.

13. Directs that bishops shall not hinder appeals to Rome, but rather themselves encourage them.

17. Enacts that the regulations of the popes Urban, Gregory, and Clement, concerning the property, wives, and families, of crusaders shall be executed.

18. Forbids, under anathema, to try causes in churchyards involving corporal punishments.

23. Directs the excommunication of those who refuse to pay tithe.

25. Forbids, under anathema, those societies in which persons bound themselves to afford mutual aid to one another under all circumstances.—*Bessin, Conc. Norm.*

Rouen, 1231. ROUEN. Held in 1231, under archbishop Maurice. Forty-nine canons of discipline were published, twenty-two of which relate to the monastic orders.

10. Orders that the hair of the concubines of priests shall be publicly cut off.

14. Directs that priests shall forbid dances in churchyards and churches, under pain of excommunication.

21. Forbids lay-persons to make their wills in the absence of the priest, except in cases of necessity.

34. Forbids deacons to administer the viaticum to the sick, to receive confessions, or to baptize, except in the absence of the priest.—*Bessin, Conc. Norm.*

ROUEN. Held June 18, 1299, under William of Flavacourt, the archbishop, in the monastery of Bonne-Nouvelle, near Rouen. Seven canons were published. Rouen, 1299.

1. Relates to the conduct of the clergy. From this canon it seems that the clergy at this time appeared publicly in short dresses, with a sword by their side; that they kept mistresses at home; that they discharged offices in the secular courts, and lent money at usury. For each of these irregularities they were sentenced to lose the revenues of their benefices for one year.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1426.

ROUEN. Held by Peter, the archbishop, in 1335. Thirteen canons were drawn up. Rouen, 1335.

1. Orders that the holy office be said devoutly.

5. Forbids patrons to present to benefices for money.

8. Relates to the repairs of the fabric, works, and ornaments, of the churches.

11. Relates to the publication of such causes as are reserved to the pope or to the bishop of the diocese.

12. Exhorts rectors of churches to be kind to mendicant friars.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1835.

ROUEN. Held December 15, 1445, by Ralph, archbishop of Rouen, with his suffragans. Forty canons were published. Rouen, 1445.

The first three recommend attachment to the faith of the church, and condemn heretical books and books of magic.

5. Forbids to swear by the body, the head, the blood, or the members, of Jesus Christ.

6. Orders that they who invoke demons, &c., shall be publicly denounced, and exposed with a mock mitre upon their heads.

7. Condemns the practice of addressing prayers to images under particular titles, as, to "our Lady of recovery," "our Lady of pity," "of consolation," and the like; because such practices tend to superstition, and to make many imagine that there is more in one image than another.

10. Renews the canon of Lateran, "Omnis utriusque sexus."

12. Forbids all compulsory fees for orders, letters of orders, confirmation, benediction of the ecclesiastical

vestments and furniture, carrying the holy Eucharist to the sick, &c.

15 and 16. Order that candidates for ordination be duly examined, and insist upon a bona fide title.

25. Forbids to communicate with excommunicated persons, and orders the priest before mass to bid them retire.

29. Forbids walking about and profane and idle talk in churches.

30. Forbids to play at any game of chance or other improper amusement on Christmas night.

34 to 38. Relate to monks.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1303.

Rouen, 1581. ROUEN. Held April 2, 1581, to promulgate the Tridentine decrees, by cardinal Charles de Bourbon, archbishop of Rouen, assisted by his suffragans. Twelve chapters were drawn up, containing, in an abridged form, all matters connected with faith and discipline. They begin with a confession of faith relating to the articles of the creed, the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, the seven sacraments, the worship of saints, indulgences, &c.; in the next place, they treat of matters relating to divine service, the administration of the sacraments, the duties of bishops and canons, holy orders, appointments to benefices, visitations, the duties of priests having cure of souls, the religious orders, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 820.

Ruffec, in Poitou, 1258. RUFFEC (in Poitou). [*Concilium Roffiacense.*] Held in 1258, August 21st, by Gerard de Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux; a regulation was published, containing ten articles, which chiefly relate to the temporal interests of the Church; all persons combining to restrain the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are declared excommunicate.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 773.

Ruffec, 1327. RUFFEC. Held in 1327, by Arnold of Bordeaux, who presided; two canons were published.

1. Directs the entire cessation of divine service in all places where lay judges, having possession of clerks, refuse, after due monition, to deliver them up to the Church.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1773.

S.

ST. ALBAN'S. [*Concilium Verulamiense* [4].] Held in 429, by S. Germanus and Lupus, against the Pelagian heresy. The authors of this detestable heresy, writes Constantius, came to the council glittering with pomp and fine dresses, and surrounded by their partizans. An immense concourse of people, men, women, and children, were assembled ; leave was given to the Pelagians to speak first, which they did, and at much length. After which, the venerable bishops poured forth, in answer, the torrent of their eloquence, supporting their own assertions by divine testimonies. Their opponents testified by their silence that they could not withstand them ; and the assembled multitude with loud shouts proclaimed the victory of the Catholics.—*Mar. Mer.* p. 233. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 3. St. Alban's, 429 (or 446, *Wilkins*).

ST. PETERSBURG. Held early in the year 1721, by order of Peter the Great. Stephen, the guardian of the patriarchal throne (during the vacancy of the patriarchate), Silvester of Smolensko, Pachomius of Voronege, Theophanes of Pskoff, Pitirim of Nijgorod, Barlaam of Tvet, Aaron of Carelia, Theodosius, the archimandrite of Nevsky Lavra, and five other archimandrites, being present, besides seven of the highest civil dignitaries. In this council the patriarchate of Moscow was destroyed, and a standing council, styled "the Most Holy Governing Synod," established, having authority over the whole Russian Church, and the supreme right of jurisdiction over all spiritual persons (except in capital cases). To its administration were committed all the estates of bishops and monasteries, and all such matters as the election of bishops, questions of heresy and schism, of marriage and divorce, &c., were referred to its jurisdiction. Stephen was appointed the president of the synod. St. Petersburg, 1721.

The regulation relating to the formation, &c., of the synod having been read in the council, it was, after the czar's signature, confirmed by the hands of all the

[4] If this deserves the name of a council, it is the earliest upon record that was held in Britain. Stillingfleet (Origines Britannicæ, chap. iv.) calls it "a solemn conference ;" and Fuller, who in his Church History (book i.) gives an account of it from Bede, applies the same expression to it.

ecclesiastics present; subsequently it was subscribed by all the bishops, archimandrites, and hegumens of the first rank in the Russian Church, and was recognized by all the eastern patriarchs.—*Mouravieff* (*Blackmore's ed.*) p. 283.

St. Quentin, 1233. ST. QUENTIN. [*Concilium apud S. Quintinum.*] Held in 1233, in the matter of Milo, bishop of Beauvais, who complained of the infraction of his rights by the king of France. (See C. of Noyon, 1233.)—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 445.

Salerno, 1596. SALERNO. [*Concilium Salernense.*] Held in 1596, by the archbishop Marius. The acts of the council are contained in twenty-nine chapters.

2. Orders that both the secular clergy and the regulars shall, within four months, deliver to the bishop's deputy a catalogue of their books, in order that those of evil tendency may be destroyed; forbids all scenic representations of our Lord's actions and of those of the saints.

3. Orders that the Christian doctrine be sedulously taught by curates and schoolmasters.

6. Relates to the veneration of saints and relics.

7. Relates to the extirpation of superstition.

9. Treats of the proper condition of churches and of their ornaments.

20. Relates to the proper celebration of divine service.

27. Condemns usury.—*Mansi. Supp.* t. v.

Saltzburg, 806. SALTZBURG. [*Concilium Salisburgense.*] Held about 806, in which the fourfold division of tithe was ordered, viz., one part for the bishop, another for the clerks, the third for the poor, and the fourth for the repair of churches.

Saltzburg, 1274. SALTZBURG. Held in 1274, by Frederick, archbishop of Saltzburg, and legate, who presided over his suffragans. The decrees of Lyons made in this year, and those of Vienna, A.D. 1267, were confirmed, and twenty-four canons published.

1, 2, and 3, relate to the duties of abbots.

4. Forbids them to wear the pontifical vestments, to bless the sacred vestments and vessels, to grant indulgences, &c.

7. Is directed against pluralities.

8. Orders residence.

10. Provides for the proper maintenance of vicars.

11. Renews the canons relating to the ecclesiastical dress and tonsure.

12 and 13. Suspend those of the clergy who are convicted of frequenting taverns and gambling-houses, and order bishops to send to prison those priests who, although excommunicated or suspended, persist in officiating at the holy office.

16. Forbids to give alms to wandering scholars.

17. Abolishes the sport practised by ecclesiastics in their churches, called "the Boy Bishop."

22. Orders a total cessation of divine service throughout the province, in case of the violent seizure of a bishop by any layman.

23. Forbids investiture at the hands of laymen.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 998.

SALTZBURG. Held in 1281, by the same prelate, with seven of his suffragans. Eighteen canons were published, most of which relate to the regulars, and are intended to repress divers abuses; amongst other things complained of, it was stated that the Benedictine monks did not wear their proper dress, nor hold triennial chapters, as ordered by Gregory IX.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1150. Saltzburg, 1281.

SALTZBURG. Held in 1291, to consider upon the best means of succouring the Holy Land. It was resolved to advise the pope to unite the templars, hospitallers, and Teutonic knights.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1358. Saltzburg, 1291.

SALTZBURG. Two councils were held here in the year 1310. In the first it was agreed, in answer to the petition of the pope, Clement V., to grant pecuniary assistance to the Roman see for two years. In the second, Conrad, the archbishop, presiding, four canons were published, of which the third forbids clerks to practise the trade of joculators and buffoons.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1513. Saltzburg, 1310.

SALTZBURG. Held in January, 1386, by the archbishop Pilgrim, legate, assisted by three bishops, and the deputies of some who were absent. Seventeen canons were published. Saltzburg, 1386.

1. Orders that in every church in the diocese the use of the cathedral church shall be followed.

5. Orders ecclesiastics to observe modesty in dress.

8. Forbids the begging friars to preach, or hear confession.—Tom. xi. p. 2061.

Saltzburg, 1418 (or 1420, *Labbe*).

SALTZBURG. Held in 1418, by Everard, archbishop of Saltzburg, and legate, for the re-establishment of discipline, which had been almost entirely lost sight of during the schism. The tenets of Wickliff and Huss were anathematized. Many ancient canons were confirmed, and thirty-four others published, making altogether fifty-nine.

1. Condemns the error of those who teach that a priest, or other ecclesiastic, having cure of souls, being in a state of mortal sin, can neither absolve nor consecrate; and declares that it is false to say that neither a bishop nor a curate can absolve a priest from the sin of fornication, on account of the vow of chastity.

2. Orders the holding of provincial councils.

6. Excludes bastards of priests and deacons from holy orders.

8. Orders rectors of churches to give vicars a sufficient maintenance.

9. Forbids to impose an interdict without weighty cause.

11. Forbids the chaplains of persons of rank to celebrate mass in private chapels, and orders them to attend at synods.

15. Regulates the method of dealing with those persons whom curates may be afraid of citing.

19. Orders that all clerks, before taking possession of a benefice, shall take an oath that they have not been guilty of simony in order to obtain it.

24. Orders a service to be said for a deceased bishop in every church of his diocese.

28. Orders curates to teach their parishioners the right form of baptism, in order that they may, in case of need, be able to baptize.

31. Excommunicates those who dare to inter bodies in churchyards during an interdict.

32. Enacts penalties against the Wickliffites and Hussites.

34. Commands, under pain of excommunication, all laymen having wives, daughters, or other women under their rule, to prohibit them the wearing of dresses of excessive length, and all unnecessary female ornaments. —Tom. xii. Conc. p. 308.

Saragossa, 380.

SARAGOSSA. [*Concilium Cæsar-Augustanum.*] Held in 380, by the bishops of Aquitaine against the Priscillianists, a sect whose leader, Priscillianus, a

Spaniard, had been instructed by a man called Marc, a native of Memphis, in Egypt, and a disciple of the Manichæans. The tenets of the Priscillianists were a mixture of those of the Gnostics, Manichæans, and Sabellians, and abounded with all sorts of impurity and errors the most gross. In their notions with respect to the blessed Trinity they agreed with the Sabellians, holding the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be but One Person; with Paul of Samosata and Photinus, they maintained that our Lord Jesus Christ had no existence before his birth of the Virgin; with Marcion and Manichæus (or Manes), they refused to allow that He really took to Himself the human nature. They declared that the devil came forth from chaos or darkness, and that he owed his origin to no one; that he was the principle of evil, that he was the master of the thunder and lightning, storms, &c.; that the souls of men partook of the Divine nature, but that for sin committed in heaven, they were given over upon earth into the hands of the princes and powers of the air, who had shut them up in bodies. These princes and powers were the devils, to whom, therefore, they attributed the formation of man. Saragossa, 590.

They abhorred the use of marriage, forbade to eat the flesh of certain animals, and denied the resurrection of the body, &c.

Their external bearing was quiet and modest, but they are said to have been very corrupt. S. Augustine calls Priscillianus an impious wretch, condemned for heresy and many horrible crimes. Their mysteries were as infamous as those of the Manichæans.

About the year 379 this sect, then, was formed, and assumed the name of its author. Some bishops allowed themselves to be carried away by it, and, amongst others, Instantius and Salvianus. Idacius, however, bishop of Merida, took up the cause of the Church with great zeal; but, wanting prudence, and hurrying on matters too far against Instantius and the others, he rather increased the evil than diminished it. At last, however, after several disputations between Idacius and the Priscillianists, the bishops of Aquitaine assembled with those of Spain in 380, and the case of the Priscillianists was brought before them. What passed in the council is not correctly known, but it is certain that the heretics did not dare to present themselves, and to

abide by the judgment of the bishops; they were, nevertheless, condemned; the bishops Instantius and Salvianus, together with Priscillianus and Elpidus, laymen, by name. Hyginus of Cordova was also excommunicated. Ithacius received instructions to publish the decree of the bishops every where. However, Instantius and Salvianus were far from yielding to the decision of the council, and even established Priscillianus as bishop of Avila.

There is but a fragment of the acts of this council left to us; in it we find the names of twelve bishops, with eight canons.

1. Condemns women who meet together with men under pretext of learning, or who hold assemblies amongst themselves to instruct other women.

2. Condemns those who fast on Sundays, and who absent themselves from church during Lent, in order to retire into the mountains or other places.

3. Condemns to perpetual anathema those who are convicted of not having eaten the sacrament of the Lord's Body given to them in church.

4. Forbids any to be absent from Church from the eighth day before Christmas to Epiphany.

5. Separates from church-communion bishops who have dared to receive persons excommunicated by other bishops.

6. Forbids clerks, under pain of being separated from the Church, to leave their ministry for the sake of entering the monastic state.

7. Is directed against those who assume the title of doctor without right.

8. Forbids to permit the veil to virgins under forty years of age, and without the bishop's permission (see the 4th canon of the council of Carthage, A. D. 397). See C. Bordeaux, A. D. 384.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1009.

Saragossa, 592. SARAGOSSA. Held November 1, 592. Eleven bishops and two deacons, the deputies of absent bishops, were present; Artemius, archbishop of Tarragona, presiding. Three canons relating to the converted Arians were made.

It is enacted by the 1st that such Arian priests and deacons as were proved to be sound in the faith, and of good character, might be admitted to serve again after having received the benediction of the presbytery.

The 2nd directs that relics found with the Arians

shall be carried to the bishop, and proved by fire, to ascertain whether they be genuine.

The 3rd enacts that churches consecrated by Arian bishops before they have received the benediction, shall be consecrated afresh.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1600.

SARAGOSSA. Held in November, 691, under Waldefred, bishop of Saragossa. Five canons were published. Saragossa, 691.

1. Forbids bishops to consecrate churches except on Sundays.

2. Directs bishops to consult the primate annually as to the time of celebrating Easter.

5. Orders that the widows of kings shall at once take the veil, and lead a religious life, to avoid the insults and want of respect to which they are subjected by remaining in the world. See C. Toledo, A. D. 683. —Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1311.

SARDICA. [*Concilium Sardicense.*] Held in May, 347, by order of the emperors Constantius and Constans, whom Athanasius, persecuted by the Eusebians (who had just intruded Gregory into the see of Alexandria), had petitioned to convoke a council. Bishops from all quarters attended, viz. from Spain, Gaul, Italy, Africa, Macedonia, Palestine, Cappadocia, Pontus, Cilicia, the Thebaid, Syria, Thrace, Mesopotamia, &c.; in all, from more than thirty-five provinces, exclusive of the orientals, who retired. The number of Catholic bishops present is not correctly known. Those from the West amounted probably to about one hundred [5]. Sardica, 347.

Hosius of Cordova is supposed to have presided. The other bishops of eminence present were Protogenes of Sardica, Maximus of Jerusalem, Paphnutius [6], Protasius of Milan, Severus of Ravenna, Lucillus of Verona, Verissimus of Lyons, Vincentius of Capua, Januarius of Beneventum, Maximinus (or Maximus) of Treves, Euphatas of Cologne, Gratus of Carthage, S. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepius of Gaza. Julius the pope sent as his representatives two priests, Archidamus and Philoxenus, and a deacon.

[5] S. Athanasius reckons about 170 in all, from east and west. Socrates says there were 300 from the west alone. The number who signed the acts of the synod in behalf of S. Athanasius was 344, but many of these were not present. Amongst the 344 are mentioned the names of British bishops.

[6] Apparently this was not Paphnutius, bishop of the Upper Thebaid, present at Nicea.

Sardica, 347. On the oriental side there were about eighty bishops, almost all of them of the Eusebian party. The chief amongst them were Theodorus of Heraclea, Narcissus of Neroniada, Stephen of Antioch, Acacius of Cesarea, in Palestine, Ursacius of Singedunum, Valens of Myrsa, Maris of Chalcedon, &c.

S. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepius of Gaza, were at the head of those who appeared to make complaint against the Eusebians. There were also multitudes of persons who came either to urge their own or the complaints of their relations and friends, who, through the machinations of the Eusebians, had been either exiled or put to death. Great indignation was also expressed concerning the forged letters circulated by the Eusebians. Theognis appears to have been guilty of doing this, in order to prejudice the emperors against S. Athanasius.

The Eusebians, when they understood that matters would be freely discussed in the council, and that no violence would be allowed, came there with reluctance, and the more so when they found persons arriving in this manner from all parts, with proofs of their violence and excess.

As soon, then, as they perceived their inability to defend either their conduct or their doctrine in such an assembly, they came to the resolution not to appear at all; and accordingly, upon their arrival at Sardica, they took up their abode in the palace, where they kept themselves close, and forcibly prevented any of their party from attending the council. Two of them, however, Macarius[7] of Palestine and Asterius of Arabia, escaped from this restraint, and made their way to the assembly, where they laid open the scheme of the Eusebians, and the threats which they held out to those of their party who were well intentioned.

As the fathers in council had already received S. Athanasius and the other accused parties, the Eusebians, who only wanted a pretext for retiring, declared that they would not take any part in the proceedings unless S. Athanasius were excluded, together with Marcellus of Ancyra, and several others. These proposals were rejected by the council, with the declaration, that they could not treat as guilty men who

[7] Or Arius.

had been already pronounced innocent by the judgment of the council at Rome, and who had the testimony of eighty Egyptian bishops in their favour. Sardica, 347.

This reasoning, however, had little effect upon the Eusebians, who for several days persisted in their demand, during which the orthodox party pressed them to prove their accusations, saying that, by keeping back, they did, in fact, condemn themselves. They continued, however, on one plea or another to absent themselves. During the time, however, they were not idle; but kept up the formalities of a synod, in which they pretended to condemn and depose S. Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepius, and others, including pope Julius. They further drew up a confession of faith, orthodox in all respects except the omission of the word "consubstantial;" and, lastly, published a synodical epistle in the name of the Sardican council. According to Socrates, this pseudo-synod was held at Philippolis after their departure from Sardica. However this may be, they resolved to leave the latter place, and, in order to have some pretext wherewith to colour their withdrawal, they pleaded that, in consequence of the victory which the emperor had lately won over the Persians, it was necessary that they should proceed to him at once to testify their joy. This ridiculous excuse, of course, was not accepted by the council, which, by letter, informed them that they must, first of all, clear themselves of the charges brought against them, and that otherwise they would be declared guilty; this threat added wings to their flight, and, by their precipitate retreat in the night, they afforded the strongest proof of their guilt.

The council then proceeded to treat of matters of faith, and declared that it was unnecessary to reagitate the question, and that they were satisfied with the creed of Nicea. After this, Athanasius and the other accused parties were introduced to prove their innocence, and the conduct of the Eusebians was put in its right light. The complaints urged on all sides against them were examined; the most important was that which charged them with communicating with the Arians who had been condemned at Nicea. The charge brought against Athanasius of having caused the death of Arsenius was best refuted by the proof that he still lived, and he is even

Sardica, 347. by some said to have been actually present in the council.

The falsehood of the story of the broken chalice[8] was as easily proved by the testimony of various witnesses from Alexandria, and by that of eighty Egyptian bishops in their letter to pope Julius. The issue of the examination was, that the fathers confirmed S. Athanasius in the communion of the Church. They also declared to be innocent four Alexandrian priests, whom the Eusebians had compelled to flee for their lives.

This done, the case of Marcellus of Ancyra, accused by the Eusebians of favouring the heresy of Paul of Samosata, was taken in hand. Marcellus appeared in person to justify himself; his accusers limited their accusation to his book. The council, therefore, after examining it, and after the context had been read, together with the passages condensed by the Eusebians, declared that the passages alluded to had been maliciously quoted as containing the sentiments of Marcellus, whereas, in fact, they were merely put in the way of question in the course of his argument, which went to prove the exact opposite to those questions. Accordingly, he was pronounced innocent, and confirmed in his bishopric. Asclepius (or Asclepas) of Gaza was also acquitted of the false charges alleged against him.

The council then proceeded to inflict penalties upon the most guilty of the heretical party. The consecrations of Gregory and Basil were annulled, and themselves declared to be neither bishops nor Christians. Those persons whom they had deposed were pronounced innocent, and the usurpers to whom their churches had been given were, in their turn, deposed; these last were Quintianus of Gaza, Acacius of Cesarea, Narcissus of Hierapolis, George of Laodicea, Menophantes of Ephesus, Ursaces of Singedunum, Valens of Myrsa, Stephen of Antioch, and Theodorus of Heraclea. The last three formed the commission sent into the Mareotis against S. Athanasius: they were sentenced to be anathematized, to be deprived of communion, and to be entirely separated from the Church. They also condemned Photinus and his heresy. See C. Sirmium, 349.

[8] Many years before, viz. in 329, the Eusebians had accused S. Athanasius of having wickedly broken a chalice. See C. Tyre.

Then the fathers addressed a letter to the emperors, entreating them to set at liberty those who still groaned under oppression. They wrote, besides, epistles to pope Julius and the clergy of Alexandria, and a circular letter to all the bishops of the Church, in which they implored them to unite with them, and to subscribe to their doctrine. In this letter they speak of the Arian heresy as the heresy of Eusebius, and they declare those persons to have obtained the glory of martyrdom who fell under the Eusebian persecution. Twenty-one canons (or twenty according to the Greek text) were also published in this council. These canons are not drawn up, as was usual, in the form of laws, but are rather propositions put by Hosius or some other bishop to the assembly, and approved unanimously. Sardica, 347.

1. Is conceived in these terms:—"Hosius, the bishop, said that an evil custom and pernicious abuse required to be abolished, by forbidding bishops to be promoted from one see to another; the cause of their doing so being well understood; for as it had never been seen that a bishop left a large bishopric to take a lesser one, it appeared clearly that avarice and ambition were the motives for these translations. Wherefore," he added, "if you desire to inflict a heavier punishment upon those who offend in this manner, they must be separated from lay-communion." And all the fathers answered, "So we would have it."

2. Declares that the same punishment, continued even to death [9], shall be inflicted upon those who pretend, in extenuation, that they have been invited to take charge of their second bishopric by the faithful who were members of it. "Because," says Hosius, "these persons may have been persuaded to make the request by bribery and the hope of future remuneration."

3. Hosius made two propositions: first, that no bishop should be permitted to enter another province unless called to assist at some judgment; and, secondly, that for the honour of S. Peter's memory, it be ordered

[9] "Perhaps none were ever denied the communion at point of death, upon repentance, but only translated bishops; and whether even they were denied it, is a question that I am not able to determine. This canon seems to me to be such a law as was never like to be executed."—*Johnson, Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, vol. ii. p. 145.

Sardica, 347. that if a bishop, condemned in his own province, maintained his innocence, his judges might write to the bishop of Rome, in order that he might determine whether the bishop's cause required a fresh hearing; that, if he and the judges whom he should nominate agreed in deeming a new trial requisite, it should be entered upon at once; but if not, the original sentence should stand good.

4[1]. Bishop Gaudentius submitted to the council an addition to the last canon, to the effect, that care should be taken that the bishop so condemned in the provincial synod, and appealing to Rome, should not be deprived of his see, nor a successor be appointed, until the cause should be entirely concluded by the pope.

5. Declares that in a case in which one bishop only shall remain in a province, and he shall neglect to consecrate another, if requisite, the bishops of any neighbouring province may come and represent his duty to him, and then if he shall persist in refusing to join with them in consecrating a bishop over those who require one, they shall themselves proceed without him to the consecration.

6. Forbids to consecrate a bishop for a small place where a priest suffices, for fear of lowering the episcopal dignity.

7. Hosius proposed, that in the case of a bishop condemned by the synod of his province, and appealing to Rome, if the bishop of Rome should decide that it was necessary to have a new trial, it should be lawful for him either to delegate the cause to the bishops bordering upon the diocese of the accused bishop, or to send legates to the spot to take cognizance of the question.

8. Forbids any bishop to go to court except he be called thither by letters from the emperor.

9. Declares that any bishop having a petition to present to the emperor for the poor of his Church shall, instead of going himself, send his deacon.

[1] The third, fourth, and seventh canons of this council are always quoted in favour of the alleged authority of the see of Rome over other branches of the Universal Church. The remarks of bishop Stillingfleet (Origines Britannicæ, chap. iii. *ad finem*), and of Dupin (Compendious Hist. of the Church, Cent. IV. chap. iv.), are conclusive with respect both to the local character of the council itself, and the limited authority which it confers, *as a new thing*, upon the see of Rome.

10. Requires the aforesaid deacon, before setting out on his journey, to address the metropolitan, acquainting him with the object of his journey, &c., in order that from the metropolitan he may receive letters of recommendation. Sardica, 347.

11. Directs those who thus proceed to Rome to present themselves to the bishop of Rome, that after having examined their business, he may, if he shall judge it expedient to do so, write to the court on their behalf.

12. Gaudentius proposed, further, that any bishop, through whose territory a clerk thus travelling to Rome should pass, should have authority to interrogate him, and if he found that he had not observed the regulations of the council, to exclude him from his communion. This also the council approved, but, at the suggestion of Hosius, it was settled that before they began to act upon this rule, time should be allowed to enable the bishops to become acquainted with these canons.

13. Hosius proposed that if a lay person (not a lawyer, or one holding any charge) were required to be elevated to the episcopate, he should first be obliged to serve for a considerable period of time the offices of reader, deacon, and priest.

14. Hosius also proposed that it should not be lawful for any bishop to remain for more than three weeks away from his diocese.

15. The foregoing canon was relaxed in favour of those possessing property out of their dioceses, whose business might compel them to remain away for more than three weeks. However, at the end of that period they were ordered to cease from attending the great church of the town at which they were, and to be contented with assisting the priest at mass in some inferior church.

16. Forbids any bishop to give the holy communion to a priest, deacon, or clerk, excommunicated by his own bishop.

17. Provides, that in order to hinder acts of oppression on the part of hasty and choleric bishops, any priest or deacon condemned by a bishop shall have leave to appeal to the judgment of the bishops of the province.

18. In consequence of the remonstrance of bishop Januarius, it was ordered that no bishop should entice

away the clerks of another bishop, in order to ordain them for his own diocese.

19. Declares such ordinations to be null and void, and that the bishop so ordaining shall be punished.

20. Ætius, bishop of Thessalonica, having certified to the council that many strangers, priests and deacons, pleased with their abode at Thessalonica, continued there for a very long period, it was ordered that the above canons made for the case of absent bishops, should have force against these particular persons.

21. Allowed a bishop driven out of his own diocese for defending the discipline or faith of the Church, to abide in that of another bishop until he should be restored to his own.

According to the Preface of Dionysius Exiguus, these canons were written in Latin; and many learned writers consider the Greek copy to be a version, and not the original.

The canons of Sardica have been received by the whole Church [2].—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 623. *Cave.*

Saumur, 1253.

SAUMUR. [*Concilium Salmuriense*, or *apud Salmurum.*] Held in 1253, in the abbey of S. Florentius, by Peter de Lamballe, archbishop of Tours, and the bishops of his province. Thirty-two canons were published.

1. Directs that the canonical hours be duly said in all cathedrals and college churches.

3. Directs that the corporals be washed by the priests or deacons in their surplices, in a vessel perfectly clean and reserved for that purpose, and that the first water, at the least, be poured down the piscina; also that the altar linen, and that of the priests, be washed by some respectable woman apart from all other things; states that, in some churches of the province, the church linen was found to be dirty and torn.

19. Orders that, if need be, the bishop shall compel abbots to restore the original number of monks in their monasteries.

27. Forbids clandestine marriages, and suspends for

[2] Dupin is, however, of a different opinion. Speaking of the regulation concerning appeals to Rome, he says, "It was neither received nor observed in the east; in the west the bishops of Africa opposed it" (see C. of AFRICA, A.D. 419); "and it was long before it was observed in the other countries of the west."

three years those of the clergy who have been present at them.

29. Forbids bishops to apply to their own use any part of the revenue of parochial churches.

30. Forbids clerks to leave any legacy to their bastards or mistresses, and declares all such legacies null and void.

32. Orders, under pain of excommunication, to observe all canons made by the archbishops of Tours.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 707.

Saumur, 1276.

SAUMUR. Held August 31st, 1276, by John de Monsoreau, archbishop of Tours, and the bishops of his province. Fourteen canons were published.

1. Orders that a light be always kept burning in all churches.

3. Forbids all pluralities of benefices with cure of souls, without the bishop's dispensation.

7. Forbids monks to have places in several different monasteries.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1011.

Saumur, 1294.

SAUMUR. Held in 1294, under Renaud de Montbason, archbishop of Tours. Five regulations were drawn up.

1. Orders all ecclesiastics and monks to wear a suitable dress, and forbids them to wear colours.

2. Prescribes the conditions upon which absolution may be given to the dying.

4. Forbids archdeacons and archpriests to send ecclesiastics about the country to receive confessions.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1395.

Saumur, 1315.

SAUMUR. Held May 9th, 1315, by Geoffry de la Haie, archbishop of Tours, who presided. Four canons were published.

1. For the preservation of Church property.

2. Against those who disturbed the ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

3. Forbids archdeacons, &c., to take any thing from those whom they examined for holy orders.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1617.

Savonieres, in Lorraine, 859, [also called Council of Tousi.]

SAVONIERES, (in LORRAINE). [*Concilium ad Saponarias*, also called *Concilium Tullense*.] Held in 859, in the presence of Charles the Bald, king of France, and his two nephews, Lothaire and Charles, sons of the emperor Lothaire. Bishops from twelve provinces attended, and thirteen canons were published.

2. Orders union amongst bishops, and the holding of synods.

6. Refers to the case of Venilon, archbishop of Sens.

8. Relates to the affairs of the Breton bishops, and forbids them to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Tours, their metropolitan.

10. Declares that the first six canons of Valence, upon the subject of grace, were read in the council, and that the bishops were divided in opinion concerning them; also that sixteen canons (including the above-mentioned six of Valence), drawn up fifteen days before at Langres, and the four canons of Quiercy against Gothescalcus, were read.

13. Sets forth an agreement entered into by the bishops present, that during their lifetime, they should each celebrate a mass for the other once a week, and that, after the death of any of them, certain specified prayers and masses should be said by the survivors. (See C. of Tousi, 859.)—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 674.

Scotland, 1187 (or 1177, *Wilkins*).

SCOTLAND. [*Concilium ad castellum Puellarum.*] Held by the legate cardinal Vivian, in which he suspended Christianus, bishop of Whithorn (*Candida Casa*), for refusing to attend the council; this last, however, according to Hovenden, "feared not the suspension, being defended by the power of Roger, archbishop of York, whose suffragan he was."—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 486.

Seleucia, in Syria, 359, pseudo-council.

SELEUCIA (in Syria.) Held Sept. 27, 359, in the church of St. Tecla, by order of the emperor Constantius. One hundred and sixty bishops were present, of whom about one hundred and five were semi-Arians, forty Anomians, and thirteen Catholics; amongst these was S. Hilary of Poitiers, who for four years had been banished into Phrygia. Amongst the semi-Arians were George of Laodicea, Silvanus of Tarsus, Macedonius of Constantinople, Basil of Ancyra, and Eustachius of Sebaste. The Anomians formed the party of Acacius of Cesarea. The thirteen catholic bishops, who probably came from Egypt, alone maintained the consubstantiality of the Word. Leonas, the imperial questor, had orders to attend the deliberations of the assembly.

The bishops forming the party of Acacius, anxious to avoid any inquiry into the several accusations and complaints which they were aware would be brought

against them, insisted that first of all the questions relating to the faith should be examined; and, after some discussion, they gained their point; whereupon, in the very first sitting, they openly renounced the council and the creed of Nicea, and maintained that the Son was of a substance different from that of the Father. These impieties, however, were not endured by the semi-Arians, who formed the largest body in the council; they made no other objection to the creed of Nicea than the use of the word "consubstantial," which they declared to be obscure; hence vehement disputes arose between the two parties, which ended in the Acacians leaving the assembly, disgusted with its decision, viz. that the formulary drawn up at Antioch in 341 should be adhered to. Seleucia, 359.

In the second sitting, the formulary of Antioch was confirmed by the semi-Arians, who were alone in the council. The Acacians, however, drew up a new formulary, full of contradictions, condemning at the same moment both the similarity of substance and the contrary.

In the third sitting the dispute was continued, Leonas having been deputed by the Acacians to attend for them, and to deliver their formulary of faith.

In the fourth the Acacians declared that they believed the likeness of the Son to the Father to consist in a likeness of will only, and not of essence; the others, on the contrary, maintained a likeness of essence also: and after much warm altercation no decision was arrived at.

In the fifth sitting the Acacians were summoned to attend to examine the case of S. Cyril, who appealed from the judgment of Acacius, by whom he had been deposed; they, however, refused either to attend or to come to any agreement concerning the faith. After having summoned them repeatedly to appear and to reply to the accusations brought against them, the council proceeded to depose Acacius, Eudoxius of Antioch, George of Alexandria, and several others. They then reduced to the communion of their own respective churches, Asterius, Eusebius, and five others, until such time as they should disprove the accusations brought against them. Another bishop was elected to the see of Antioch. The sentence of the council was not, however, carried into effect, the deposed bishops

having interest enough at court to prejudice the emperor in their favour.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 804.

Seleucia, in Chaldea, 410.

SELEUCIA. Held in 410, in order to re-establish ecclesiastical discipline in Persia and Mesopotamia. Twenty-seven canons were made.

1. Orders prayers to be made for princes.

2. Contains a profession of faith agreeing with that of Nicea.

3. Orders that the consecration of a bishop be performed by three bishops at the least.

5. Excludes from every ministration priests and deacons who do not observe strict continence.

6. Ordains the same thing with respect to clerks guilty of usury.

7. Excommunicates all who have dealings with enchanters, &c.

10. Directs that priests and other clerks shall eat in a place distinct from the poor.

11. Orders that their sleeping rooms also shall be separate.

15 and 16. Ordain that there shall be but one archdeacon in each diocese, who shall act as the arm and tongue of the bishop, to publish and execute his will.

20. Permits the archdeacon to celebrate the holy Eucharist in the absence of the bishop, and gives him power to punish deacons under certain circumstances.

25. Forbids bishops to ordain priests and deacons any where save before the altar.—*Mansi, Supp.* tom. i. col. 285.

Selingstad, 1022.

SELINGSTAD. [*Concilium Salegunstadiense.*] Held in August, 1022, by the emperor Henry; Aribo, archbishop of Mayence, presiding. Twenty canons were published.

3. Forbids the celebration of marriages from Advent to the octave of the Epiphany, from Septuagesima to the octave of Easter, during the fourteen days preceding the feast of S. John the Baptist, and on fast days and vigils.

4. Forbids a priest having drunk any thing after cock-crow in summer to say mass on the following day; allows of cases of necessity in winter.

6. States that complaints had been made of the conduct of some very foolish priests, who were in the habit of throwing the corporal into a fire, for the sake of extinguishing it, and strictly prohibits it.

9. Forbids talking in church or in the church porch.

10. Forbids lay persons, and particularly matrons, to hear daily the gospel, "In principio erat Verbum," and particular masses, such as the mass of the Holy Trinity or of S. Michael. The canon seems to imply that this had been done, not out of devotion, but for purposes of divination.

16. Forbids any person to go to Rome without first obtaining the permission of his bishop or his deputy.

18. Notices the folly of those who, being guilty of some crimes, despise the penance imposed upon them by their own priests, and trust to obtaining a plenary absolution from the Roman pontiff, and declares that such indulgence shall not be granted to them; but that, in future, they shall first fulfil the penance imposed, and then go to Rome if they choose it, having first obtained leave from their own bishop.

After the canons follows an appendix concerning the manner of celebrating a council.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 844.

SENLIS. [*Concilium Silvanectense.*] Held in 873, by the bishops of the provinces of Sens and Rheims, in which Carloman, the son of king Charles the Bald, was brought to judgment, deposed from every ecclesiastical dignity, and reduced to lay-communion, on account of his treasonable and other evil practices.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 257. Senlis, 873.

SENLIS. Held November, 14, 1235, by the archbishop of Rheims and six of his suffragans, who put the whole of the king's domains within the province of Rheims under an interdict. (See C. of COMPIEGNE, A. D. 1235.) Senlis, 1235.

SENLIS. Held in 1310, by Philip de Marigni, archbishop of Sens. Nine templars were condemned and burned, denying, in the hour of death, their previous confession of guilt, which had been extorted from them by torture.—*Dubois, Hist. Paris*, p. 551. Senlis, 1310.

SENLIS. Held in 1315 or 1316, by Robert de Courtenay, archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans, in which Pierre de Latilly, bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne (accused by Louis Hutin of the death of Philip le Bel, and of another murder, and imprisoned) demanded his liberty and the restitution of his property. Subsequently he was entirely justified of the charge, Senlis, 1315, or 1316.

and was left in quiet possession of his bishopric. He died in 1372.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1623.

Senlis, 1326. SENLIS. Held in 1326, by William de Brie, archbishop of Rheims, with seven of his suffragans (present either in person or by deputy). Seven canons were made.

1. Lays down the proper forms to be observed in holding councils.

4. Declares excommunicated persons to be incapable of suing at law, of defending themselves, and of giving evidence.

5. Excommunicates those who violate the asylum afforded by churches, either by dragging away forcibly those who have taken refuge there, or by refusing them nourishment.

6. Against clandestine marriages.

7. Against those who impeded ecclesiastical jurisdiction.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1768.

Sens, 1140. SENS. [*Concilium Senonense.*] Held in 1140. Amongst those present were Louis VII., Samson of Rheims, and Henry of Sens. In this council, S. Bernard charged Abelard, who was present, with his errors, accusing him of making *degrees* in the Trinity, as Arius had done; of preferring free-will to grace, with Pelagius; and of dividing Jesus Christ, with Nestorius; he produced extracts taken from his works, and called upon Abelard either to deny having written them, or to prove their truth, or to retract them. Abelard, instead of defending himself, appealed to Rome; whereupon the bishops present contented themselves with condemning his doctrine, passing no sentence upon him personally, out of deference to Innocentius II., to whom Samson and three of the bishops wrote, requesting his concurrence in their judgment. The pope condemned Abelard in the same year, and, in his answer to the letter of the bishops, declared that he concurred with them in the sentence they had passed, and that he had imposed perpetual silence upon Abelard. The latter published an apology, in which he confessed the sound Catholic faith, declared that he desisted from his appeal, and retracted all that he had written contrary to the truth. He died, in the end, in the monastery of Clugny, after ten years of retreat and penitence. (See C. of Soissons, 1121.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1018.

SENS. Held in 1199, by the legate Peter, against the Poplicans (or Populicani), a sect of Manichæans, (the author of which, called Terricus, was burnt.) An investigation was made into the cases of those who were accused of this heresy; amongst others, the dean of Nevers, and Raynaldus, abbot of S. Martin, were charged with it; the latter was deposed, being found guilty, not only of this heresy, but of two other errors, viz. that of the Stercoranists and of that of the Origenists, who taught that all men will at last be saved; both of them appealed from the decision of the council to the pope.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 3. Sens, 1199.

SENS. Held in May, 1320, by William de Melun, archbishop of Sens. Four statutes were published. Sens, 1320.

1. Enacts that the bishops should grant an indulgence of forty days to those persons who would fast on the vigil of the feast of the Holy Sacrament.

2. Directs that places in which clerks were forcibly detained should be laid under an interdict.

4. Condemns those priests who dressed themselves improperly, such as, in red, green, yellow, or white boots, &c., and wore beards and long hair.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1680.

SENS. Held in 1485, by Tristan de Salazar, archbishop of Sens, in which the constitutions published by his predecessor, Louis, in a council held A.D. 1460, were confirmed. Amongst other matters treated of were the following, viz. the celebration of the holy office, the reform of the clergy and of the monks, the duties of laymen towards the Church, &c.; also it is enacted that canons shall be considered to have been absent who are not present at nocturn, before the end of the "Venite," at the other hours before the first Psalm, and at mass before the end of the last "Kyrie;" most of these regulations were taken from the canons of Basle, and Lateran, and from the Pragmatic[3].—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1721, Append. Sens, 1485.

SENS. See C. of PARIS, 1548. Sens, 1548.

SEVILLE. [*Concilium Hispalense.*] Held No- Seville, 590.

[3] Chapter 3. forbids the dances and theatrical shows which it was at that time the custom to exhibit in churches; but allows the observances of old customs at Christmas and Easter, if conducted with devotion and decorum. Forbids, also, the sport of the mock bishop, introduced into the churches, invested with the episcopal ring, staff, mitre, and vestments.

vember 4, 590, composed of eight bishops; S. Leander, bishop of Seville, presiding. It was decided that the donations and alienations of Church property made by the bishop Gaudentius were uncanonical and void; nevertheless, it was decreed that the serfs who had been freed by him should remain free, although still subject to the Church, and should be prohibited from leaving their property to any persons except their children, who should also remain, in perpetuity, subjects of the Church; also, authority was given to the lay judges to separate the clergy from their wives or mistresses.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1588.

Seville, 618 (or 619, *Labbe*).

SEVILLE. Held in Nov. 618, by S. Isidore, the archbishop, at the head of seven other bishops, against the Acephalists, who denied the two natures in one person. Various regulations, chiefly relating to the particular circumstances of their Church, were also drawn up. All the acts of the council are contained in thirteen chapters.

1. Theodulphus, bishop of Malaga, having complained of the conduct of the bishops of his neighbourhood, who, during the confusion consequent upon the war, had appropriated to themselves much of his territory, it was ordered that all should be restored to him.

4. Forbids the ordination of clerks who had married widows, and declares such to be void.

5. Orders the deposition of a priest and two deacons, ordained under the following circumstances:—The bishop, who laboured under an affection of the eyes, had merely laid his hands upon them, whilst a priest pronounced the benediction.

7. Relates to the conduct of Agapius, bishop of Cordova, who, being little skilled in ecclesiastical discipline, had granted permission to certain priests to erect altars and consecrate churches, in the absence of the bishop. The council forbids all such proceedings for the future.

10 and 11. Confirm the recent establishment of certain monasteries in the province of Betica, and forbid the bishops, under pain of excommunication, to take possession of their property; also allows monks to take charge of property appertaining to nunneries, upon condition that they dwell in distinct houses, and abstain from all familiar intercourse with the nuns.

13 and 14. Assert the doctrine of two natures in our

Lord Jesus Christ united in one person.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1663.

SICILY. [*Concilium Siculum.*] Held in 365 or 366, by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, and the oriental deputies, who convoked the bishops of the country, in order to confirm the faith as settled at Nicea, and nullify the proceedings at Ariminum; the use of the term "consubstantial" was approved, and the bishops drew up a synodal letter after the form given by pope Liberius. (See C. Tyana.)—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 830. Sicily, 366.

SIENNA. [*Concilium Senense.*] Held first at Pavia, and subsequently translated to Sienna, in 1423. This council lasted till the 26th of February, 1424, and many sessions were held. Amongst the acts is a decree against the heresies previously condemned at Constance, and against all aiding and abetting the Wickliffites and Hussites. Indulgence was granted to their persecutors. The question of a reunion with the Greek Church was also debated, and its further consideration postponed. It was determined that every thing relating to the reformation of the Church should be referred to the council about to be holden at Basle.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 365. Sienna, 1423.

SIRMIUM. [*Concilium Sirmiense.*] The first synod of Sirmium was held in 351, against Photinus, bishop of that see. His heresy was similar to that of Paul of Samosata; he denied the existence of our Lord before his birth of the Virgin, and maintained that He was merely man; but admitted that the Holy Spirit descended into Him, and that He might in a subordinate sense be called the Son of God. After having been condemned in the council of Milan in 347, he betook himself to Constantius, and demanded a fresh hearing before judges to be appointed by the emperor; this was granted to him, and he pleaded his cause against Basil of Ancyra in the presence of certain judges, all laymen, nominated by the emperor. He was, however, again condemned in the synod of Rome, A.D. 349, (in which Valens and Ursaces embraced the communion of S. Athanasius); an information of the decree against him having been forwarded into the East, the oriental bishops met at Sirmium in this year, to confirm the act of condemnation, and to pass sentence of deposition upon Photinus, which was accordingly done. There seems to be some question about the orthodoxy of the Sirmium, 351.

bishops who composed this council, as they drew up a formulary of faith, which is denounced by S. Athanasius as erroneous. S. Hilary, however, commends it as Catholic. It is not to be confounded with the confession which Hosius of Cordova was, by threats and violence, compelled to sign in a subsequent council, held in 357, from which the words *οὐσία*, *ὁμούσιον*, were rejected.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 729. *Pagi in Bar.* A.D. 351, note xii. *Cave's Apostolici*, p. 406.

Sirmium, 357. SIRMIUM. Held by order of the emperor Constantius, who was at the time in Sirmium, at the instigation of the Arian bishops, who, having drawn up a new formulary of faith, rejecting the words *οὐσία*, *ὁμοουσία* and *ὁμοιουσία*, in which the Father was declared to be greater than the Son, endeavoured to force the Catholic bishops to subscribe it, and especially Hosius of Cordova. The old man, yielding to torture and imprisonment, at last consented, and signed the confession of faith; but Athanasius testifies that before his death he anathematized the Arian heresy.—*Cave's Apostolici.*

Soissons, 744. SOISSONS. [*Concilium Suessionense.*] Held March 3, 744, by order of Pepin. Twenty-three bishops were present. The heretic Adelbert was condemned in this council; and ten canons were published.

1. Recognizes the Nicene creed.

4. Forbids fornication, perjury, and false witness, to the laity; orders all priests to submit to their bishop, to render an account to him every year of their conduct, to receive him when making his visitations, and to obtain from him the holy rite and chrism.

5. Forbids to receive strange clerks.

6. Directs bishops to take all possible measures for the extirpation of paganism.

7. Orders that the crosses which Adelbert had set up in his diocese should be burnt.

8. Forbids clerks to retain any women in their houses, except their mother, sister, or niece.

9. Forbids lay persons to retain in their houses women consecrated to God; forbids them also to marry the wife of another man in his lifetime, for that no man may put away his wife except for adultery. (See C. of Rome, 745.) Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1552.

Soissons, 853. SOISSONS. Held April 26, 853, in the monastery of S. Medard, under Hincmar of Rheims, composed of

twenty-six bishops, from five provinces. The king, Charles the Bald, was present during the deliberations of the council, which lasted through eight sessions. Thirty canons were published.

1. Recapitulates and confirms the judgment pronounced against Ebbo and the clerks whom he had ordained; also confirms the elevation of Hincmar to his see.

2. Relates to the case of Heriman, bishop of Nevers, at the time out of his mind, whose church was committed to the care of his archbishop.

4. Orders Amaulry, archbishop of Tours, to take charge of the bishopric of Mans, the bishop, Aldricus, being afflicted with paralysis, having addressed a letter to the synod for assistance, asking for their prayers during his life and after his decease.

7. Orders that the king be requested to send commissioners, who should re-establish divine service in the monasteries.

Mansi adds three other canons.—*Supp.* tom. i. col. 929. Tom. viii. Conc. p. 79.

SOISSONS. Held August 18, 866, by order of Charles; thirty-five bishops attended. The clerks ordained by Ebbo, and who had been deposed in the council of 853, were, by indulgence, re-established. Vulgude, one of the number, was, in this same year, consecrated archbishop of Bourges.—*Hincm. Opusc.* 18. Tom. viii. Conc. p. 808. Soissons, 866.

SOISSONS. See C. of Trosby, A.D. 909. Soissons, 909.

SOISSONS. Held in 1092 or 1093, by Raynaldus, archbishop of Rheims, against Roscelin the Tritheist. Fulco, bishop of Beauvais, attended in behalf of Anselm, abbot of Bec (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury), whom Roscelin, both in private and in his writings, had falsely charged with holding the same opinions as himself, viz. that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were three distinct beings, existing separately, and that it might be said that there were three Gods, were not the expression harsh, and contrary to the phraseology in use. Being questioned before the assembly, he explained his views, and abjured the heresy imputed to him; but no sooner was the council dissolved, than he recanted, declaring that he had made his abjuration before the synod merely through fear of being assassinated by the ignorant populace unless he did so. Soissons, 1092.

Upon this Anselm wrote his tract, "De Incarnatione," which he dedicated to Urban II. Subsequently, Roscelin, finding himself regarded by all Catholics as a heretic, and avoided, betook himself to Ivo, bishop of Chartres, imploring his assistance, and abjuring again all his errors. At last he died, in retreat, in Aquitaine. —*Pagi in Baron.* A.D. 1094. Tom. x. Conc. p. 484.

Soissons, 1115. SOISSONS. Held in 1115, by Conon, bishop of Præneste. From this council deputies were sent to the Carthusians, entreating and commanding them to send back into his diocese Godfrey, bishop of Amiens, who had retired amongst them. This command was executed in the beginning of Lent. Another council was held in the same year at Rheims, upon the same subject, by the legate Conon. (See C. of Beauvais, 1114.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 801.

Soissons, 1121. SOISSONS. Held in February, 1121, by Conon, bishop of Præneste[4], and legate. In this council, Abelard was compelled to burn his book upon the subject of the Blessed Trinity, and was desired to make a confession of faith; he accordingly, with many tears and much difficulty, read the creed of S. Athanasius; he was then sent to the monastery of S. Medard, at Soissons, and subsequently to that of S. Denys.—(See C. of Sens, 1140.)—Tom. x. Conc. p. 885.

Soissons, 1456. SOISSONS. Held July 11, 1456, by John, Archbishop of Rheims, who presided. The execution of the decrees of Basle was ordered, and the acts of the assembly of Bourges were confirmed, several other canons were enacted, which relate, amongst other things, to the dress of bishops, the approval of confessors, the preaching of indulgences, &c. — Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1396.

Strigonia, or Gran, in Hungary, 1114. STRIGONIA (or Gran in Hungary). Held in 1114, by Lawrence, the archbishop. Sixty-five canons were published.

2. Orders that the epistle and gospel be explained every Sunday to the people in large churches; in small parishes the creed and the Lord's prayer.

3. Orders that in all large churches there shall be clerks of every degree.

4. Orders that the people shall come to the sacraments of penance and the holy Eucharist at Easter and Christmas; the clerks at all the great festivals.

[4] Or Palestrina.

6. Orders that ignorant priests shall be deposed. Strigonia, 1114.

10. Enacts a penalty for not calling in the priest in time of dangerous sickness; in case of death, the penalty to be enforced against the wife or relations of the deceased; or, if he have none, against his agent and two of the old persons of the place in which he lived.

11. Forbids to raise to the episcopate a married man, unless with the wife's consent.

15. Forbids bishops and priests to keep slaves.

17. Forbids to consecrate a church which is not endowed.

18. Forbids to ordain a clerk without a title.

27. Directs that the bishop shall regulate the nourishment and manner of life to be observed by canons, according to their rule.

28. Declares that the children of persons who have voluntarily embraced a canonical life, may not lay claim to their property without their consent.

32. Forbids deacons and priests to marry after ordination.

37. Directs that abbots shall be seldom absent from their houses, and then only for a short time, and after notice given to the bishop.

38. Forbids abbots to use the episcopal ornaments, and denies to them the power of preaching, hearing confessions, and baptizing.

39. Forbids to confer holy orders upon monks.

46. Directs that nothing be said or sung in Church but what has been ordered in synod.

47 and 48. Relate to drunkenness amongst ecclesiastics.

49. Relates to the same vice amongst the laity.

50. Directs that in every city the bishop shall have two houses for the incarceration of penitents.

53. Directs that a woman thrice deserting her husband shall, if noble, be put to penance, without any hope of ever being restored to him; if a woman of low degree, be sold as a slave. Also orders that a husband slandering his wife, by accusing her of adultery, shall suffer the same punishment. Orders the same penalties against a husband deserting his wife from motives of hatred and aversion; and gives liberty to the wife in such case to marry another.

54. Deposes any clerk marrying a second time, or marrying a widow or divorced woman.

55. Appears to allow of priests who have married twice exercising their office, if their wives consent to separate from them.

59. Forbids clerks to keep taverns, or to practise usury; deposes those who drink at taverns without sufficient cause.

61. Forbids Jews to keep any Christian servants.—*Mansi, Supp.* Tom. ii. Coll. 283, &c.

Suffetum, 523. SUFFETUM. [*Concilium Suffetanum.*] Held in 528, at which S. Fulgentius was present. Bishop Quod-vult-Deus (who had disputed the point of precedency with him at the council of Junga in Africa), at his request, presided.

Sutri, near Rome, 1046. SUTRI (near ROME). [*Concilium Sutrinum.*] Held in December, 1046, by Henry the Black, king of Germany. Gregory VI. was invited to this council, and came, hoping to be recognized as sole pontiff; but finding various difficulties and obstacles in the way, he renounced the papacy, stripped himself of his ornaments, and gave back the pastoral staff, after having held the papal chair about twenty months.

After the council Henry, accompanied by the prelates who had been present, came to Rome, and by common consent of the Romans and Germans Suidger was elected pope, who took the name of Clement II., and was consecrated on Christmas Day.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 943. *Baronius*, A. D. 1046.

Synnada, 230. SYNNADA. [*Concilium Synnadense.*] Held about 230, or, according to some, in 256, upon the subject of Cataphrygian baptism. Baptism received out of the Church was declared to be null and void.—Tom. i. Conc. p. 760.

T.

Tarragona, 516. TARRAGONA. [*Concilium Tarragonense.*] Held in 516, during the reign of Theodoric, king of Italy, and guardian of Amalric, king of Spain. Ten bishops were present, and thirteen canons published.

3. Forbids usury amongst clerks.

4. Forbids bishops, priests, and clerks, to judge any cause on Sundays; allows them to do so on other days, provided they do not interfere in criminal cases.

7. Directs that the priest or deacon appointed to any

country parish shall remain there during his week (*i. e.* that the priest shall remain there one week, and then the deacon shall succeed him and keep his week) in order to celebrate Divine service with the clerks; and that *on Saturday* all the clergy shall attend in order to begin the Sunday office[5]. It also orders that matins and vespers shall be said daily.

11. Forbids monks to leave their convent in order to perform any clerical function, without leave from their superior.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1562.

TARRAGONA. Held in 1242, by Peter, the archbishop, against the Waldenses in Arragon. Part only of the acts remain.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 592. Tarragona, 1242.

TELEPTA (or Tella). [*Concilium Telense* or *Teleptense.*] Properly Zella (which see). Telepta,

THIONVILLE. [*Concilium apud Theodonis-villam.*] Held in 822. Thirty-two bishops being present; amongst whom were Aistuphus of Mayence and Ebbo of Rheims. Four or five articles were drawn up in defence of ecclesiastical persons and property.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1519. Thionville, 822.

THIONVILLE. Held in February, 835; more than forty bishops being present. All the proceedings against Louis le Débonnaire were declared to be null and void, and he was conducted to the cathedral church of Metz, and solemnly restored to his rights and privileges. This done, the prelates returned to Thionville, where Agobard of Lyons and Bernard of Vienne, who were absent, were solemnly deposed, together with Ebbo of Rheims, who, being present, himself consented to the sentence, and renounced the episcopate.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1695. Thionville, 835.

THIONVILLE. Held in October, 844, in a place called at present "Just" (Judicium); Drogon, bishop of Metz, presided. In this council Lothaire, Louis, and Charles, promised to observe brotherly concord amongst themselves. Six articles were drawn up, which the princes promised to observe. They are exhorted, amongst other things, to live in unity and brotherly love; to fill without delay the sees which, owing to their quarrels, had remained vacant; to hinder Thionville, 844.

[5] "Hence, perhaps, arose the custom, prevalent through almost the whole of Spain, of ceasing from work on Saturdays at the hour of vespers."—*Vasæus, Chron.*

the laity from appropriating to themselves the property of the Church, &c.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1800.

Thorp, 1363. THORP. See canon 3, C. York, A. D. 1363.

Thuringia, 1105. THURINGIA. [*Concilium Quintilineburgense* or *Northusense.*] Held in 1105, by the emperor Henry, who had lately succeeded in reuniting Saxony to the Roman obedience. The council was held in the palace. The decrees of the preceding councils were confirmed; the heresy of the Nicolaitans (meaning the concubinage of the clergy) was condemned, &c.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 744.

Toledo, 400. TOLEDO. [*Concilium Toletanum.*] Held on the 1st September, 400, under Patronus, the bishop. The reason for assembling this council, which consisted of nineteen bishops, was the troubles and disturbances caused by the heresy of the Priscillianists [6], which sprung up towards the close of the fourth century. Nineteen bishops, from all the Spanish provinces, attended. Many of the sect of the Priscillianists who presented themselves, were received back into communion with the Church, after having abjured their errors [7]. In this council the bishop of Rome is, for the first time, spoken of simply by the title of "pope." Twenty canons were also published.

1. Permits to admit married men to the office of deacon, provided they will observe continence.

2. Forbids to admit to any higher order than that of sub-deacon a man who had publicly done penance, and even restricts his administration of that office.

4. Enacts that a sub-deacon, marrying a second time, shall be reduced to the rank of porter or reader, and shall not be permitted to read the gospel or epistle; should he marry a third time, he shall be separated from the Church for two years, and then be admitted to lay communion only.

5. Deprives all priests and clerks who, having been appointed to any church in town or country, do not assist daily at mass.

7. Permits clerks whose wives do not lead a decorous life to bind them or shut them up, and to make

[6] See C. Saragossa.

[7] Amongst these were two bishops, Dictinius and Symphosius, father and son, who were permitted to retain their sees, but were suspended for a time from communion with other Churches.

them fast; forbids them to eat with them until they have done penance.

12. Forbids a clerk to leave his own bishop in order to attach himself to another.

13. Warns those who attend the other offices of the Church, but who do not communicate, that they must either receive the holy Communion, or take place amongst the penitents, upon pain of excommunication.

14. Orders that any one who shall have received the holy Eucharist, without eating it, shall be driven from the Church as guilty of sacrilege.

17. Excommunicates a married man keeping a concubine; but permits unmarried men to do so. Allows either a wife or a concubine [8].

20. Restricts the consecration of the chrism to the bishops; orders all priests to send a deacon or subdeacon to the bishop at Easter, in order to receive it from him.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1222.

TOLEDO. Held about 447, during the popedom of Leo I., against the Priscillianists [9]. Nineteen bishops attended, who condemned the heresy and the followers of Priscillian in a formulary of faith directed against all heretics, to which eighteen anathemas are attached [1].—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1465, (*Hispanicum*) *Baronius*, ann. 447, § 17, &c. Toledo, 447.

TOLEDO. Held May 17, 531; Montanus, bishop of Toledo, presiding over seven other bishops. Five canons were published. Toledo, 531.

[8] "Si quis habens uxorem Fidelis, concubinam habeat, non communicet; ceterum is qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur; tantum ut unius mulieris, aut uxoris, aut concubinæ, ut ei placuerit, sit conjunctione contentus."—*Nat. Alex. Tract. III. de Sacramentis*, cont. iii. Opusc. i. p. 629. The following note from Labbe may be subjoined: "In notis decreti Gregoriani exponitur hoc decretum de justâ concubinâ, ex sentent. B. Augustini lib. de bono conjugali, quæ est uxor minus solenniter ducta." See also the note at p. 1239, Conc. tom. ii.

[9] See C. Saragossa.

[1] In this council, according to Baronius, the addition of the words "Filioque" was, for the first time, made to the article of the Constantinopolitan Creed concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost. This addition was afterwards confirmed by the third, fourth, eighth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth councils of Toledo, and was received by the Catholic Visigoths and in France. By some this formulary of faith is referred (wrongly, as Pagi shows) to the council of Toledo, A.D. 400; by others, to that in 589.

1. Relates to the treatment of children offered by their parents to be brought up for holy orders.

Others relate to the continence of the clergy, the preservation of Church property, &c.

In this council Toledo is, for the first time, spoken of as a metropolitan see.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1734.

Toledo, 589. TOLEDO. Held May 8, 589; Leander, the primate of Seville, presiding over seventy-two bishops, from the different provinces under the rule of king Reccaredus, who attended in person. Eight deputies were also present. The main object of the council was to confirm the conversion of the Goths who had abjured Arianism, and who here presented a confession of faith, in which they declared their assent to the first four œcumenical councils, and anathematized the principal errors of the Arian party. Twenty-three canons were published, and as many anathemas directed as against other heresies and evils, so against those who deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and those who refuse to anathematize the council of Ariminum.

2. Directs that, according to the king's writ, the Constantinopolitan creed shall be sung by the people in every church in the kingdom before the Lord's Prayer in the Eucharistical office.

5. Relates to the rule of continence to be observed by heretical bishops, priests, and deacons, when reconciled to the Church, as well as by all clerks.

7. Orders that some portion of Holy Scripture shall be read daily at the tables of priests, to prevent idle conversation.

11 and 12. Relate to penitence. Forbid to reconcile without penance; forbid the priest to admit to penance without first cutting off the hair of the penitent, if a man, or changing her dress, if a woman.

14. Forbids Jews to have Christian women for wives or concubines.

19. Leaves it to the bishop to fix the endowment to be given to a newly founded church.

22. Forbids to say any thing but psalms at the funerals of the religious.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 997.

Toledo, 597. TOLEDO. Held May 17, 597; sixteen bishops attended; two canons only remain, and the subscription of thirteen bishops only appear.

1. Orders that priests and deacons who will not

observe the law of continence shall be degraded, shut up in a cloister, and put to penance.

2. Forbids the bishop to appropriate to himself the revenues of any church or chapel in his diocese, and declares that they belong to the ministering priest.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1603.

TOLEDO. Held in 610; Aurasius, bishop of Toledo, presiding over fifteen bishops. The primacy of the see of Toledo over all the churches of the province of Carthagena was established, and subsequently confirmed by an edict of king Gundemar.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1620. Toledo, 610.

TOLEDO. A national council was held in this city on the 9th of December, 633[2], assembled from the whole of Spain, and that part of Gaul which was in subjection to the Goths; S. Isidore of Seville presided, sixty-six archbishops and bishops being present[3]: amongst them were the metropolitans of Narbonne, Merida, Braga, Toledo, and Tarragona. Seventy-five canons were published. Toledo, 633.

1. Contains a profession of faith upon the subject of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation.

2. Directs that the same order of prayer and of psalmody shall be observed throughout the kingdom, and the same manner of celebrating mass.

3. Orders that a national council shall be held annually, if possible; otherwise a council in each province.

4. Relates to the proper mode of holding synods, and is of some length. It orders that on the first day of the synod, the church shall be cleared before sunrise, and all the doors shut except one; that the bishops shall enter first, and take their seats in a circle, according to the date of their consecration; then the priests; after them the deacons, who are ordered to stand in sight of the bishops; and last of all, the laity and notaries: this done, the door is directed to be shut, and silence and devotion enjoined upon all; then the archdeacon, standing up, shall bid them pray: upon which all shall prostrate themselves upon the floor, and after private prayer, mingled with sobs and tears, one of the bishops

[2] In the third year of the reign of king Sisenandus, who, at his first entrance into the assembly, prostrated himself on the ground before the clergy, imploring their mediation with the Almighty.

[3] Sixty-two bishops and seven proctors of absent bishops.—*Garcias.*

Toledo, 633. shall rise up and say a prayer, to which all shall respond *Amen*. All having risen up and taken their places, a deacon in an alb shall read the canons relating to the holding of councils, and the metropolitan shall invite the bishops to proceed to business. It is forbidden to proceed to another matter until the first has been disposed of. Any clerk or layman desiring to appeal to the council is enjoined to mention his cause to the metropolitan archdeacon, who shall declare it to the council. No bishop is allowed to leave the synod before the others, nor shall the council be dissolved until every thing is settled.

5. Directs that the metropolitans shall consult together before Epiphany concerning the proper time for celebrating Easter, and shall signify their determination to their suffragans.

6. Approves of leaving the question about single and trine immersion open; but orders single immersion to be practised throughout Spain, to prevent schism.

7. Orders that the Passion be preached on Good Friday, and that the people, in an audible voice, ask forgiveness of their sins, in order that, being thereby purified from sin, they may worthily celebrate the great festival of Easter, and partake of the holy Eucharist with a pure heart.

8. Deprives of the Easter communion those who break their fast on Good Friday before sunset, exception being made in favour of old and sick persons, and children.

9. Relates to the benediction of the candles, &c., on Easter Eve.

10. Is directed against an abuse then prevalent in many churches, in which the Lord's Prayer was said on Sundays only; orders all clerks to say it daily at the office, either openly or privately.

11. Forbids to sing the Hallelujah during Lent.

12. Orders that immediately after the Epistle the Gospel should be read, which should be followed by the Lauds[4], which in some churches were improperly sung after the Epistle.

13. Condemns the opinion of those who deemed it wrong to sing hymns composed by men in honour of

[4] These were canticles appointed by the Mosarabick Office to be sung before the Offertory.

the apostles and martyrs, on account of their not being taken out of Holy Scripture, nor authorized by tradition [5]. Toledo, 633.

14. Orders that the canticle, "Benedicite, Opera Omnia," be sung on Sundays and Feast-days at mass, at the entrance of the chancel [in pulpito].

15. Orders, under pain of excommunication, that at the end of each psalm shall be sung, "Glory *and honour* be to the Father," &c., and not merely "Glory be," &c.

17. Excommunicates those who refuse to acknowledge the inspiration of the Apocalypse, and also those who refuse to read it in church from Easter to Pentecost.

19. Enumerates the cases in which persons may not be admitted to holy orders.

25. Is directed against ignorance in the clergy; requires them to be acquainted with Holy Scripture and the canons.

26. Orders that a priest, when appointed to any parish, shall receive a copy of the ritual from the bishop, and that, when the priests attend the litanies or synods, they shall give account to the bishop of their manner of celebrating the holy office and administering holy baptism.

33. Forbids the bishop to take for his own share more than one-third of the revenue of the churches within his diocese.

34. Enacts that thirty years' possession shall give to a bishop lawful right over a church situated in the diocese of another bishop, if in the *same province*.

39. Forbids the deacons to pretend to the privileges of the priesthood, and to sit in the first places.

40. Forbids them to wear two stoles, which it declares to be unfit for even a bishop or priest; directs them to wear the stole over the left shoulder, and also that it be clean, and not worked with colours or with gold.

41. Orders all clerks, as well as the priests and deacons, to shave the entire crown of the head, and to leave but a slight rim of hair in the form of a circle.

46. Orders that a clerk found plundering a tomb be

[5] It states that some objected to the singing of the Gloria Patri at the end of each Psalm on this account.

deposed from every ecclesiastical rank and office, and subjected to three years' penance.

51. Forbids bishops to ill-treat monks, but grants to them the exercise of their canonical authority over them, such as exhorting them to observe a good and holy life, instituting abbots and other officers, correcting those who infringe the rules, &c.

52. Enacts that monks forsaking the monastic state, in order to marry and settle in the world, shall be brought back and put to penance.

57. Forbids to compel Jews to profess Christianity; with regard to the compulsory conversions under king Sisbertus, it allows that they should continue to be considered as Christians, because they had received baptism, chrism, and the holy Eucharist.

The following nine relate to the Jews, and to Christians who had apostatized to Judaism.

The 66th and following eight relate to the case of slaves.

75. Anathematizes all who conspire against regal authority.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1700.

Toledo, 636. TOLEDO. Held in 636, under king Chintila; Eugenius, bishop of Toledo, presiding; twenty-two bishops, in all, were present. Nine canons were published, of which,

1. Orders public litanies every year for three days, beginning December 14th, except one of the three should prove to be Sunday, in which case the litany days were to be observed in the week following.

All the others relate to the prince, and the strengthening of his powers, &c.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1735.

Toledo, 638. TOLEDO. Held January 9th, 638, under Silva, metropolitan of Narbonne, in the second year of the reign of king Chintila. Fifty-two Spanish and Gallic bishops were present, either in person or by deputy. Eighteen canons were published.

3. Enacts that, for the future, no king should ascend the throne without making a vow to defend the Catholic faith, and to rid the country of infidels; pronounces anathema against those who should violate this oath.

7. Orders that persons who, after having been admitted to penance, quit that state and resume the secular dress, shall be arrested by the bishop, and compelled to perform their course of penance, whether they will or not, in some monastery.

Fleury observes that this is the first time that we find mention of this compulsory penance, which evinced entire ignorance of the sound practice of antiquity.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1740.

TOLEDO. Held about 646, under king Chintasuinthus, by twenty-eight bishops present, and the deputies of eleven who were absent. Six canons were published. Toledo, 646.

2. Allows the bishop, or any other priest who may be present, to complete the celebration of the sacred mysteries, when the celebrating priest is unable to proceed through sickness; excommunicates those who, without such cause, leave the celebration unfinished, or who celebrate after having partaken of the slightest particle of food.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1836.

TOLEDO. Held in 653, under Orontius of Merida; the king, Resesuinthus, being present, and fifty-two bishops, with the deputies of ten absent. The prince read his profession of faith, in which he acknowledged the first four œcumenical councils. Twelve canons were published. Toledo, 653.

1. Contains a definition of faith.

2. Condemns all oaths and vows to commit evil actions.

3. Condemns all persons guilty of simony.

7. Condemns those who forsake the episcopal or sacerdotal office upon pretext of having been admitted to such holy office unwillingly; orders those who so return into the world and marry to be shut up for life in a monastery.

8. Forbids to ordain ignorant clerks.

9. Excludes from the Easter communion, and from the privilege of eating meat for twelve months, those who break the Lent fast.

12. Confirms the canons of a former council concerning the Jews.

Besides the bishops and deputies present, we find amongst the signatures, those of ten abbots, the archpriest of Toledo, and sixteen counts.

After the subscriptions there is a synodal decree, concerning the disposition of the king's property, and an edict of the king, confirming it.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 394.

TOLEDO. Held November 2, 655, Eugenius, the archbishop, presiding; sixteen bishops attended, and Toledo, 655.

seventeen canons were published, most of which tend to repress the abuses committed by bishops in the administration of Church property.

11. Forbids to confer orders upon the slaves of the Church, except they have been first set free by the bishop.

18. Orders that newly-baptized Jews shall show themselves in the assemblies of the Christians on all Jewish festivals.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 451.

Toledo, 656. TOLEDO. Held December 1, 656, under Reccasuinthus; twenty bishops were present, amongst whom were Eugenius, the metropolitan of Toledo, Fugitivus, the metropolitan of Seville, and S. Fructuosus, the metropolitan of Braga[6]; five bishops who were absent sent deputies. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that the feast of the Annunciation shall, in future, be kept on the 18th of December, because that, falling in Lent, it interfered with the fast, and often with the celebration of Good Friday.

3. Forbids bishops to present churches to their relations and friends for the sake of the revenue to be derived.

6. Directs that children devoted by their parents to the tonsure shall be compelled to lead the life of the religious; does not allow parents so to devote their children, after they have attained to ten years of age, without their own consent.

7. Forbids to sell Christians to Jews.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 459.

Toledo, 675. TOLEDO. Held November 7th, 675, under king Wamba; seventeen bishops, (amongst whom was Quiritius of Toledo,) the deputies of two others, and six abbots, were present. In this council the division of the country into dioceses was made, and sixteen canons of discipline were published.

3. Orders all the bishops of the province to conform to the order and ritual in use in the metropolitan church.

4. Forbids to suffer priests who are at variance to approach the altar, or to receive their offerings.

[6] Fructuosus was elected to the see of Braga in this very council, in which the former prelate, Potamon, of his own accord, came forward and accused himself of certain crimes, for which he was deposed.

6. Deprives ecclesiastics who take part in the judgment of capital cases.

8. Enacts penalties to be enforced against priests who demand a fee for christening or for the chrism; orders bishops to punish such offenders under pain of suspension.

13. Forbids persons possessed with a devil to serve at the altar, or to approach it.

14. Orders that mass shall never be celebrated by one priest only, lest he should be taken ill, and the mass left unfinished.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 539.

TOLEDO. Held January 9, 681, under king Ervigius. Julian of Toledo presided, at the head of thirty-four bishops, amongst whom were the metropolitans of Seville, Braga, and Merida. Thirteen canons were published. Toledo, 681.

1. Approves of the resignation of king Wamba, who had assumed the religious habit.

4. Declares to be null and void the consecration of a bishop for a little town in the immediate vicinity of Toledo, made by the bishop of Merida against his own will, and against the canons, at the command of Wamba; and generally forbids to consecrate a bishop to a place which has not hitherto had a bishop.

6. Enacts that, in order to prevent any further delay in filling up the vacant bishoprics, it shall be lawful for the bishop of Toledo to consecrate those persons whom the king shall choose, without prejudice, however, to the rights of the province.

10. Confirms, with the king's consent, the privilege of asylum to those who take refuge in a church, or any where within thirty paces of it.

11. Orders the abolition of every remnant of idolatry. —Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1221.

TOLEDO. Held in November, 683, under king Ervigius, who was present; forty-eight bishops, four of whom were metropolitans, attended, Julian of Toledo presiding. Twelve canons were published, the Nicene Creed having been first read, which from this time was sung in all churches in Spain.

The fifth is the extraordinary canon, which absolutely forbids the widows of kings to re-marry even with princes.

From the tenth it appears not to have been uncommon at this period for persons (even bishops) in time of dan-

gerous illness to submit to be put to public penance without confessing, or their conscience accusing them of, any particular sin, but for greater security.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1253.

Toledo, 684. TOLEDO. Held at the request of pope Leo II., under king Ervigius, to receive and approve the sixth œcumenical council held at Constantinople against the Monothelites; seventeen bishops, ten deputies, and six abbots, attended. In the answer of the bishops to Leo they make no mention of the fifth œcumenical council, saying in canon 7, that they decree that this council (the seventh œcumenical) shall rank after the council of Chalcedon, in honour, place, and order.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1278.

Toledo, 688. TOLEDO. Held May 11, 688, under king Egica, Julian of Toledo presiding over sixty bishops, in order to explain certain expressions made use of in a confession of faith drawn up by the Spanish bishops some years before, which had given offence to pope Benedict II. These expressions related to the two wills in our Lord Jesus Christ; and it was decreed to be not contrary to Christian truth to maintain that in God the will proceeds from the will—"*voluntatem ex voluntate procedere.*"—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1294.

Toledo, 693. TOLEDO. Held May 2, 693; composed of fifty-nine bishops, five abbots, and the deputies of three bishops absent; there were also present the king Egica and sixteen lords. In this council the decision of the previous council, concerning the procession of the will from the will, and of the essence from the essence, in God, was further explained. Twelve or thirteen canons were published.

6. Relates to the conduct of some priests, who, instead of using bread made for the purpose in the holy Eucharist, contented themselves with offering on the holy table common bread cut into a round form. The canon orders that the bread used at the altar shall be made expressly for that purpose.

9. Excommunicated for life and deposed Sisbertus of Toledo, convicted of conspiring against the person of king Egica and his family.—Tom. vi. Conc. 1327.

Toledo, 694. TOLEDO. Held November 9, 694. The subscriptions of the bishops present are lost. Eight canons were published[7].

[7] The cause of the convocation of this council was an insurrec-

1. Directs that during the three days preceding the opening of any council, and during which a strict fast ought to be observed, nothing shall be discussed which does not refer to matters of faith, morals, and ecclesiastical discipline.

3. Orders that bishops, following the example of our Lord, shall observe the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor on Holy Thursday.

5. Condemns to excommunication and perpetual imprisonment priests who, from a vile and wicked superstition, shall say the office of the mass for the dead for the living, in order by so doing to cause their death.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1361.

TOLEDO. Held November 21, 1324, by John, archbishop of Toledo. Eight canons were published; in the preface to which it is ordered that they shall be observed together with those which the legate William de Gondi, bishop of Sabino, had made in the council of Valladolid (1322). These canons, amongst other things, order bishops to attend the synods, and relate to the conduct and dress of clerks; forbid priests to demand any thing for masses said by them, but allow them to receive voluntary offerings; forbid to say more than one mass in a day, except on Christmas Day.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1712. Toledo, 1324.

TOLEDO. Held 1339, by Ægidius, archbishop of Toledo, six bishops being present. Five canons were published. Toledo, 1339.

2. Forbids to ordain any illiterate person.

3. Provides that in cathedral or collegiate churches some shall be compelled to study theology, the canon law, and the liberal arts.

5. Orders all rectors to keep a list of such of their parishioners as are of age, in order to effect the observation of the canon "*Omnis utriusque sexus.*"—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1869.

TOLEDO (or Arenda). Held December 5, 1473, in the borough of Arenda, by Alphonso de Carille, archbishop of Toledo. This council was numerously attended, and twenty-nine canons were published. Toledo, or Arenda, 1473.

1. Orders that provincial councils shall be held biennially, and diocesan synods annually.

tion of the Jews against the king. It was decreed (c. viii.), that those who had rebelled should be sold as slaves, and all their property confiscated.

Toledo, 1473.

2. Orders curates to instruct their flocks in the principal articles of belief.

3. Forbids to promote to holy orders persons ignorant of Latin.

4. Forbids to receive a clerk from another diocese without letters from his bishop.

5 and 6. Relate to the dress of bishops and clerks; forbid them to wear garments made of red and green silk, short garments, and white shoes, &c.

7. Relates to the proper observance of Sundays and Festivals.

8. Forbids ecclesiastics to wear mourning.

9. Orders the punishment of incontinent clerks.

10. Forbids to admit to parochial churches or prebends persons ignorant of Latin, unless, for good cause, the bishop shall think fit to dispense with it.

11. Inflicts a pecuniary fine upon ecclesiastics who play with dice.

12. Orders that all priests shall celebrate mass four times in the year, at the least, and bishops three times.

13. Forbids all preaching without the bishop's licence.

14. Enacts penalties to be enforced against clerks in the minor orders who do not wear the clerical habit and observe the tonsure.

15. Forbids ecclesiastics to furnish soldiers to any temporal lord, except the king, or to accept of lands upon condition of so doing.

16. Forbids the celebration of marriages at uncanonical times.

17. Excommunicates those who are married clandestinely without five witnesses, and suspends for three months the priest who shall officiate.

18. Excommunicates those who buy or sell the property of a vacant benefice.

19. Forbids the custom of performing, at certain times, spectacles, &c. and singing songs, and uttering profane discourses in churches.

20. Directs that persons dying of wounds received in duels shall not be allowed Christian burial, even though they may have received the sacrament of penance before death.

21. Excommunicates those who hinder the clergy from receiving tithe and enjoying their privileges, &c.

23. Orders that sentences of excommunication pro-

nounced in any one diocese shall be observed in all others.

24. Places under an interdict the place from which any clerk has been forcibly expelled.

25. Forbids any sort of fee on account of ordination.

27. Grants to the bishop the power of absolving from synodal censures.

28. Provides for the publication of these canons in diocesan synods and in cathedral churches.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1448.

Toledo, 1565.

TOLEDO. Held in 1565, September 8. Christopher de Sandoval, bishop of Cordova, was called upon to preside, on account of his being the oldest bishop of the province. The bishops of Siguença, Segovia, Palencia, Cuença, and Osma, attended, with the abbot of Alcala le Real. Three sessions were held; in the first the decree of Trent, relating to the celebration of provincial synods was read; also a profession of faith, which was signed by all present. In the second session, thirty-one articles of reformation were published, relating to bishops, curates, officials, proctors, residence, and divine service. In the third session, held 25th March, twenty-eight articles were drawn up, and the decrees of Trent relating to residence were read. Bishops were directed not to admit to the tonsure those who had no benefices immediately in view. Rules were laid down to guide curates in preaching, and instructing their people, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 751.

Tortosa, in Catalonia, 1429.

TORTOSA (in Catalonia). [*Concilium Dertusense.*] Held in 1429 by Peter Cardinal de Foix. All the prelates and many ecclesiastics of the kingdoms of Arragon and Valencia, and of the principality of Catalonia, attended. The king's letters patent confirming the liberties and immunities of the Church were read; and at the end of the fourth session twenty canons were approved and published.

4. Orders that all beneficed clerks and ecclesiastics in holy orders shall keep breviaries, in order that they may say the office privately when hindered from attending in the choir.

5. Forbids the elevation of unworthy persons to holy orders.

6. Orders curates every Sunday to teach by catechizing some part of the things necessary to be known by Christians in order to salvation, which it declares to

be as follows: 1. What they ought to *believe*, contained in the articles of the faith. 2. What they ought to *pray for*, contained in the Lord's Prayer. 3. What they ought to *keep*, contained in the ten commandments. 4. What they ought to *avoid*, viz. the seven mortal sins. 5. What they ought to *desire*, viz. the joys of paradise. 6. What they ought to *fear*, viz. the pains of hell.

9. Orders neophytes to bring their children to church within eight days after their birth, in order that they may receive baptism.

15. Forbids the delegates of the holy see to go beyond their commission.—Tom. xii. Conc. p. 406.

Toule, 859. TOULE. See C. Savonieres, 859.

Toulouse, 1056. TOULOUSE. [*Concilium Tolosanum.*] Held in 1056, September 13, eighteen bishops being present. Rambaldus, archbishop of Arles, and Pontius, archbishop of Aix, presiding. Thirteen canons were published.

1. Forbids simony.

3. Forbids any fees for consecrating a church.

4. Forbids all buying and selling of church preferment.

5. Enacts that, if a clerk have entered upon the monastic state in order to obtain an abbacy, he shall be compelled to continue the religious life, but shall be entirely excluded from the honour he coveted.

6. Orders abbots to see that their monks follow the rule of S. Benedict in their manner of life, food, dress, &c. Any abbot or monk altering (*corrigentes*) these institutions to be corrected by his own bishop.

7. Enjoins celibacy upon priests, deacons, and other clerks holding ecclesiastical dignities; offenders to be deprived.

8. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, lay persons to apply church property to their own use.

9. Forbids the laity to plunder the effects of dead persons.

10 and 11. Relate to the payment of Church-dues and tithes.

13. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, all intercourse with heretics and excommunicated persons, unless for the purpose of converting them and bringing them back from their evil ways.

In this council Berenger, viscount of Narbonne, made complaint of the conduct of archbishop Guifroi, accusing him of giving away the lands appertaining to the Church

of Narbonne to those who had borne arms for him. The event of his complaint is unknown.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1084.

TOULOUSE. Held July 15, 1119; pope Calixtus II. presiding, assisted by his cardinals, and the bishops and abbots of Languedoc, Gascony, and part of Spain. Ten canons were published. Toulouse, 1119.

1. Is directed against the buying and selling of holy orders or livings.

3. Is directed against the followers of Peter de Bruis, a sect of Manichæans, ordering that the secular authorities shall repress those who affect an extreme piety, condemn the holy sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, infant baptism, the priesthood, and other ecclesiastical orders, and lawful matrimony; directs that they shall be driven out of the Church as heretics.

5. Forbids to make slaves of free persons.

10. Excommunicates monks, canons, and other clerks, who quit their profession, or who allow their beard and hair to grow after the fashion of the people of the world.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 856.

TOULOUSE. Held in 1161, convoked by the kings of France and England, who were present. One hundred bishops and abbots of the two kingdoms attended, and solemnly recognized Alexander III. as pope, to the exclusion of Victor II.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1406. Toulouse, 1161.

TOULOUSE. Held in September, 1229. The archbishops of Narbonne, Bordeaux, and Auch, being present, with many other bishops and abbots. Raymond, count of Toulouse, with several lords, attended; also the seneschal of Carcassone, and the two consuls of Toulouse. Forty-five canons were published for the extinction of heresy, and the re-establishment of peace. Toulouse, 1229.

The first seven relate to the heretics. They enact that the archbishops, bishops, and exempted abbots, shall appoint in every parish a priest, and two or three laymen of good character, who shall take an oath constantly and minutely to search for heretics in houses, caves, and every place in which they may be hid; and, having taken precautions that those whom they have discovered shall not escape, to report the fact to the bishop, the lord of the place, or his bailiff.

6. Orders that the house in which any heretic shall be discovered be destroyed.

Toulouse, 1229.

8. Forbids to punish any one as a heretic before the bishop has given his sentence.

10. Orders that heretics who have of their own accord recanted shall not be suffered to remain in their own villages, but shall be carried to some place free from all suspicion of heresy; orders them to wear two crosses upon their dress; forbids to entrust them with any public office, &c.

11. Orders that such as pretend to be converted through fear of death, or from any other motive, shall be shut up, in order that they may never again corrupt others.

12. Orders every man above fourteen years of age, and every woman above twelve, to abjure heresy, to make open profession of the Roman faith, and to swear to hunt out the heretics. This to be repeated every two years. Recusants to be looked upon as heretics.

13. Requires all persons arrived at years of discretion to confess to their own priest three times a year, and to receive the holy communion at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; those who neglect to do so to be considered as heretics.

14. Forbids the laity to have in their possession any copy of the books of the Old and New Testament, except the Psalter, and such portions of them as are contained in the Breviary, or the Hours of the blessed Virgin; most strictly forbids these works in the vulgar tongue.

16. Declares all wills to be void which are not made in the presence of the priest or his vicar.

25. Forbids to absent oneself from church on Sunday.

26. Declares the following to be Festival days, viz. all Sundays; Christmas Day; Feasts of S. Stephen, S. John the Evangelist, the Holy Innocents, S. Sylvester, the Circumcision, the Epiphany; Feasts of the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Nativity of the blessed Virgin Mary; Easter; the two days after Easter; the three Rogation days; Whit-Sunday; the two days after Whit-Sunday; Feasts of the Nativity of S. John the Baptist, and the Invention and Exaltation of the Holy Cross; the Feasts of the Twelve Apostles; Feasts of S. Mary Magdalene, S. Laurence, S. Martin, S. Nicholas, and the Dedication of S. Michael; and the Feasts of the Dedications of every

church and of all Saints to whose honour churches have been built.

42. Forbids women possessed of castles and other fortified places to marry men who are enemies to the faith and to peace.

43. Forbids judges to receive bribes.

44. Orders that counsel be provided gratis for the poor.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 425.

TOULOUSE. Held in May, 1590, by the cardinal de Joyeuse, archbishop of Toulouse, assisted by the bishops of S. Papoul, Rieux, and Lavaur, and the deputies of the bishops of Lombez, Pamiers, Mirepoix, and Montauban. Various regulations were made, relating to the duties of bishops, chapters, beneficed clerks, priests, and others; they also embrace the following subjects:—The holy sacraments, relics, indulgences, festivals, vows, seminaries, hospitals, excommunications, residence, &c.—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1378. Toulouse, 1590.

TOURS. [*Concilium Turonense.*] Held November 18, 461, by S. Perpetuus, archbishop of Tours, assisted by nine bishops. Thirteen canons were made for the restoration of the ancient discipline. Tours, 461.

1 and 2. Enjoin celibacy upon bishops, priests, and deacons.

3. Forbids them to live with or be on terms of too great familiarity with any woman.

4. Forbids a clerk to marry a widow.

5. Excommunicates those who renounce the ecclesiastical state.

6. Is directed against those who marry or offer violence to virgins consecrated to God.

7. Excommunicates homicides.

8. Condemns those who fall away from a state of penance after having entered upon it.

9. Deprives of communion bishops who get possession of the bishopric of another, or who promote the clerks of another bishop.

10. Declares ordinations made contrary to the canons to be null.

11. Condemns ecclesiastics who leave their own church, and go to another diocese, without their bishop's leave.

12. Condemns clerks who leave their dioceses to travel without letters from their bishop.

13. Condemns usury in clerks; allows other business and employments.

Mansi adds to these thirteen canons six others.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1049.

Tours, 566, or 567.

TOURS. Held November 17, 566; convoked by order of king Charibert, and composed of nine bishops. Amongst whom were Germanus of Paris, Prætextatus of Rouen, and Euphronius of Tours, who presided. Twenty-seven canons were published.

1. Orders provincial councils twice a year.

3. Forbids to place the Body of Jesus Christ upon the altar after any fashion, and orders that it shall be placed under the cross[8].

4. Forbids laymen to come close to the altar with the clerks during the office; but allows them, and women also, to enter the sanctuary for private prayer at other times, and also in order to receive the communion.

5. Orders each Church to maintain its own poor, that they may not be obliged to wander about.

6. Forbids clerks and lay persons to give letters commendatory (epistolium), allows this to bishops only.

12. Orders married bishops to live with their wives as with sisters.

15. Orders that monks who leave their monastery in order to marry shall be separated from their wives, and put to penance; and that the aid of the secular powers shall be entreated in order to effect this.

17. Orders that monks shall fast during the three Rogation days and during the whole of Whitsun-week; from that time to the 1st August three days in each week; during September, October, and November, also three days in each week; and during December every day till Christmas. Again on the first three days of January; and from Epiphany to Lent, three days in each week.

23. Allows hymns composed by an author of respectability to be used at the holy office besides those of S. Ambrose.

27. Declares that bishops taking any fee, &c., for

[8] "Ut Corpus Domini in altari non in imaginario ordine sed sub crucis titulo componatur," which, according to Baronius, means that the host shall not be placed amongst the images usually standing upon the altar, but only under the cross.

ordination, are to be regarded not merely as guilty of sacrilege, but even as heretics.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 851.

TOURS. Held in 813, by order of Charlemagne, for the purpose of re-establishing ecclesiastical discipline. Fifty-one canons were published. Tours, 813.

1. Orders the people to be faithful to the emperor, and to pray for his preservation.

2. Orders bishops to give themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the Gospels and the Epistles of S. Paul, and to try to learn them by heart.

3. Orders them to acquaint themselves with the canons and the pastoral of S. Gregory.

4, 5, and 6. Order that they shall preach frequently, that they shall be frugal in their repasts, and entertain the poor and strangers, affording them both bodily and spiritual food.

7. Forbids priests to be present at plays and farces, and all immodest exhibitions.

9. Forbids priests to administer indiscreetly the Lord's Body to boys and any chance persons, lest they be in sin, and so receive the greater damnation.

15. Anathematizes those who give money in order to obtain a benefice.

16. Orders bishops to take care that the tithes of each church be divided between the priests, the poor, and the repairs, &c., of the church.

19. Warns priests not to administer the holy Eucharist inconsiderately to children.

21. Forbids priests to eat and drink in taverns.

27 and 28. Forbid to give the veil to young widows, without good evidence of their sincere love of a religious life, and to virgins under twenty-five years of age.

37. Orders that prayer be made kneeling at all times, except on Sundays and during Easter.

38. Warns the faithful not to make a noise when entering church, not to talk when there, and to keep all bad thoughts out of their minds.

39. Forbids to hold pleadings in churches or church-porches.

40. Forbids to hold pleadings or markets on Sundays.

43. Is directed against the wicked habit of swearing.

50. Orders all persons to communicate at least thrice

a year, unless hindered by some great crime.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1259.

Tours, 1055. TOURS. Held in 1055, by Hildebrand, the Roman legate (afterwards Gregory VII.), and cardinal Geraldus[9]. In this council Berenger was called upon to defend his opinions; but, not being able to do so satisfactorily, he retracted, and made a public confession of the true faith, which he signed; whereupon the legates, believing him to be sincere, received him into communion.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1081.

Tours, 1060. TOURS. Held in 1060, by cardinal Stephen, the Roman legate, and ten bishops. Ten canons were made.

The first four condemn simony.

6. Declares that those bishops, priests, and deacons, who, although aware of the interdict of Nicholas II., refused to abstain from the exercise of their functions, being at the time in a state of incontinence, should be irrevocably deposed.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1108.

Tours, 1096. TOURS. Held in Lent, 1096, by pope Urban II., who presided. The decrees of the council of Clermont were confirmed. The pope received into favour king Philip (who had been excommunicated for forsaking Bertrade his lawful wife), upon his humbly making satisfaction[1].—Tom. x. Conc. p. 601. *Pagi.*

Tours, 1163. TOURS. Held May 19, 1163, in the church of S. Maurice, by pope Alexander III., assisted by seventeen cardinals. There were also present, besides Louis VII., king of France, one hundred and twenty-four bishops, four hundred and fourteen abbots, and an immense multitude of others, both ecclesiastics and laics. These prelates were assembled from all the provinces in subjection to the kings of France and England; some few of them also were Italians, who had declared for Alexander. Amongst the English prelates was Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, who was received by the pope with extraordinary honours, all the cardinals present, except two in immediate attendance upon

[9] It seems probable that Geraldus presided, not in this, but in a previous council held at Tours, of which Eusebius (Bruno), bishop of Angers, makes mention in his epistle to Berenger.

[1] This is the account of Bertholdus; but Labbe accuses him of error, and asserts that the reconciliation of king Philip took place in the council of Limoges, held in this year (which see). It seems to be more probable that Philip applied for absolution in this council, and was refused.

Alexander, being sent beyond the city walls to meet him. The archbishop of Canterbury sat on the right hand of the pope, the archbishop of York on the left. The immediate object of the council was the condemnation of the synods of Pisa and Lodi, convoked by the emperor Frederic. Ten canons were published.

2. Condemns usury amongst the clergy.

4. Is directed against the Albigenses, and forbids all intercourse with them; forbids even to give them a retreat or protection, or to buy and sell with them.

5. Forbids to let churches to priests for an annual rent.

8. Forbids monks to leave their cloisters in order to practise medicine or to learn the civil law.

9. Declares all ordinations made by Octavianus[2], and other heretics or schismatics, to be null and void.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1411.

TOURS. Held June 10, 1236; Juhel de Mayenne, archbishop of Tours, presiding. Fourteen canons were published. Tours, 1236.

1. Forbids the crusaders or other Christians to kill or injure the Jews, or to plunder or ill-use them in any way; also orders the secular judges to give up to the ecclesiastical authorities any crusaders whom they may have seized on account of any crime.

7. Orders that all wills shall be put into the hands of the bishop or his archdeacon within ten days after the death of the testator.

8. Denounces those who have two wives living, declares them to be infamous, and orders that they shall be tied up in public, unless they can pay a heavy fine; orders priests to publish every Sunday in church the sin of having two wives living.

13. Orders the bishops to instruct and to provide for the subsistence of the new converts from Judaism and heresy.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 503.

TOURS. Held in 1239, by Juhel de Mayenne, archbishop of Tours, and his suffragans. Thirteen canons were published, "with the approbation of the holy council;" the use of which expression in this case shows that the approbation was not confined to the pope and his legates. Tours, 1239.

1. Orders that the bishop shall appoint three clerks,

[2] Cardinal Octavianus, who in 1159 was elected pope, in opposition to Alexander III., under the title of Victor VIII. His election was made by two cardinals only.

or three reputable laymen, in every parish, who shall take an oath to report faithfully concerning all scandals in morality, faith, &c., happening in the neighbourhood.

4. Forbids to receive any thing for the administration of the sacraments; without prejudice, however, to pious customs.

5 and 6. Forbid curates and rectors to excommunicate their parishioners of their own authority.

12. Forbids clerks and monks to retain any female servants in their houses or priories.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 565.

Tours, 1282. TOURS. Held August 1, 1282, by John de Monsoreau, archbishop of Tours, who presided. Thirteen canons were published.

1 and 2. Are directed against needless lawsuits.

3. Forbids clerks and monks to frequent taverns.

4. Excommunicates those who steal or tear the church books and injure the furniture.

5. Orders the observance of customary processions.

6. Orders the punishment of usurers according to the canon of Lyons.

12. Is directed against those who hinder the payment of tithe.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1183.

Tours, 1448. TOURS. See C. of Angers, 1448.

Tours, 1510. TOURS. A general assembly of the French clergy was held, by order of Louis XII., in September, 1510, on account of the sentence of excommunication passed against him by pope Julius II. The object of the council was to discuss the question, how far it was necessary for Louis to respect the spiritual weapons of the Church, when in the hands of an adversary who used them only to further injustice, and in matters purely temporal. Eight questions were discussed. The following are the most important:—

2. Is it allowable for a prince, in defence of his person and property, not only to repel injustice by force of arms, but to seize the lands of the Church in the possession of the pope, his declared enemy, not with any view of retaining them, but only in order to cripple the pope's means of injuring him? Answer, in the affirmative.

3. Is it allowable for a prince, on account of such declared hatred on the part of the pope, to withdraw from the obedience of the latter, the pope having stirred up other princes to make war upon him, and

urged them to seize upon his territories? Answer: that it is lawful so to withdraw from obedience, not, however, altogether, but so far as the defence of the prince's temporal rights shall render necessary.

4. This withdrawal from obedience being supposed, how is the prince to conduct himself with regard to his subjects, and the prelates with regard to other ecclesiastics, in all those matters in which recourse is usually had to the see of Rome? Answer: it is necessary in such a case to keep to the ancient common rights, and the Pragmatic Sanction taken from the decrees of the council of Basle.

8. If the pope, without any attention to justice, or even to the appearance of right, employs arms and artifices, and publishes censures against the prince, and against those who protect and defend him, ought the latter to be deserted? Answer: that such censures are altogether null, and not binding in law.—Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1481.

TOURS. Held in September, 1583; Simon de Maillé, the archbishop, presiding; the bishops of Angers, Nantes, S. Brien, Rennes, and Quimper, and the deputies of those of S. Malo and Mans, were present. Tours, 1583.

A petition was read, which it was proposed to present to the king, Henry III., requesting him to order the publication of the decrees of Trent in his states; also another petition to the pope, to induce him to remedy certain abuses in the matter of benefices. A formulary of faith, to be signed by all beneficed clerks, was drawn up, and regulations were made to prevent simony. In consequence of the appearance of the plague in Tours, the prelates adjourned the council to Angers. (See C. of Angers, 1583.)—Tom. xv. Conc. p. 1001.

TOUSI. [*Concilium Tullense*, or *apud Saponarias.*] Held in June, 859. Charles the Bald and the sons of the emperor Lothaire were present. Thirteen canons were published, of which the 1st treats of the reconciliation of Charles and his brother Louis. The 6th relates to a charge of treason brought by Charles the Bald against Venilon, archbishop of Sens. Canon 8 relates to the case of the Breton bishops, who had been guilty of schism in separating from their metropolitan. The 10th contains certain dogmas relating to grace, (originally put forth in the first six canons of Valence, in the synod of Quiercy,) concerning which there arose Tousi, 859.

a great contention amongst the bishops present. Synodal letters were addressed to Venilon, the Breton prelates, and to those factious and seditious persons, whose unbridled licentiousness had caused extreme disorder. (See C. of SAVONIERES, 859.)—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 974.

Tousi, 860. TOUSI. [*Concilium Tullense*, or *Tussiacense*.] Held at Tousi, a place in the diocese of Toul, 860. Forty bishops from fourteen provinces attended. Five canons were published, directed against robbery, perjury, and other crimes, then very prevalent. Although only forty bishops were present, these canons are signed by fifty-seven; the decrees of councils being often sent to the bishops who were absent, for their signature.

1. Is directed against invaders of sacred things.
2. Concerning the incontinence of virgins or widows consecrated to God.
3. On perjury and false witnesses.
4. Against robbers and others guilty of various crimes.
5. Concerning vagabond clerks and monks.

A synodal letter was also drawn up, addressed to the invaders of ecclesiastical rights and property, and the plunderers of the poor.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 702.

Trent, 1545, falselystyled œcumenical. TRENT. [*Concilium Tridentinum.*] This council was first convoked, June 2nd, 1536, by pope Paul III., to be holden at Mantua, May 23rd, 1537. In the bull of convocation he declares that, anxious to free the Church from the new heresies which had sprung up, and desirous to bring back the ancient state of discipline, he had thought it expedient and necessary to call an œcumenical council. Subsequently, the duke of Mantua having refused to permit the assembling of the council in that city, the pope prorogued the meeting to November, without naming any place. Afterwards, by another bull, he prorogued it till May, 1538, and named Vicenza as the place of assembly; in the meantime, he nominated certain cardinals and prelates to look into the question of reform, who, in consequence, drew up a long report upon the subject, in which they divide the abuses needing correction into two heads:—

1. Those concerning the Church in general.
2. Those peculiar to the Church of Rome.

Paul himself proposed a reformation in full consistory; but opinions were divided, and the question was referred to the coming council.

When the time arrived, however, not a single bishop appeared at Vicenza; whereupon the pope again prorogued the council to Easter, 1539, and subsequently forbade its assembling until he should signify his pleasure upon the subject. Trent, 1545.

At last, at the end of three years, in the year 1542, after much dispute between the pope, the emperor, and the other princes in the Roman communion, as to the place in which the council should be holden, the pope's proposition that it should take place at Trent was agreed to; whereupon the bull was published, May 22nd, convoking the council to Trent on the 1st of November in that year. Subsequently, he named as his legates in the council, cardinal John del Monté, bishop of Palestrina, the cardinal priest of S. Croix, Marcellus Cervinus, and the cardinal deacon Reginald Pole. However, difficulties arose, which caused the opening of the council to be further delayed, and the first meeting was not held until December, 1545.

The council was opened, and the first session held, December 13th, when there were present, the three legates, four archbishops, and twenty-two bishops, in their pontifical vestments. Mass was said by the cardinal del Monté, and a sermon preached by the bishop of Bitonte[3]; after which, the bull given November 19th, 1544, and that of February, 1545, were read, and the cardinal del Monté explained[4] the objects which were proposed in assembling the council, viz. the extirpation of heresy, the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline, the reformation of morals, and the restoration of peace and unity. He then exhorted the fathers to avoid disputes, and to labour only for the glory of God, whose eyes were upon them, as well as those of the angels, and the whole Church. Session I. Dec. 13, 1545.

The next session was then appointed to be holden on the 7th of January following.

On the 18th and 22nd of December, congregations were held, in which some discussion arose about the care and order to be observed by prelates in their life and conversation; amongst other things noticed was

[3] Which (say Fra Paolo Sarpi and his annotator) every body condemned, for its fulsome flattery, profane allusions, ridiculous comparisons, and general unworthiness.

[4] According to Raynaldus, this speech of the cardinal was not made in this, but in the following session.

Trent, 1546. the abuse introduced at Rome, where the prelates at all times, except when engaged in the exercise of their functions, wore the secular dress.

On the 5th of January another congress was held, in which cardinal del Monté proposed that the order to be observed in conducting the business of the council should be the same with that at the last council of Lateran, where the examination of the different matters had been entrusted to different bishops, who for that purpose had been divided into three classes; and when the decrees relating to any matter had been drawn up, they were submitted to the consideration of a general congregation; so that all was done without any disputing and discussion in the sessions. A dispute arose in this congregation about the style to be given to the council in the decrees. The pope had decreed that they should run in this form, "The Holy Œcumenical and General Council of Trent, the Legates of the Apostolic See presiding," but the Gallican bishops, and many of the Spaniards and Italians, insisted that the words "representing the universal Church," should be added; this, however, the legates refused, remembering that such had been the form used in the councils of Constance and Basle, and fearing lest, if this addition were made, the rest of the form of Constance and Basle might follow, viz. "which derives its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and to which every person, of whatever dignity, not excepting the pope, is bound to yield obedience."

Session II. Jan. 7, 1546. In the second session, four archbishops (amongst whom were Oläus Magnus, titular archbishop of Upsal, and Robert Vaucop, titular archbishop of Armagh); twenty-eight bishops (amongst them the bishop of Worcester), three abbots, and four generals of orders, were present, making in all forty-three prelates.

A bull was read prohibiting the proctors of absent prelates to vote; also another, exhorting all the faithful then in Trent to live in the fear of God, and to fast and pray. The learned generally were exhorted to give their attention to the question, how the rising heresies could be best extinguished. The question about the style of the council was again raised.

In the following congregation, Jan. 13, the same question was again debated, the legates declaring that such discussions, by showing the want of unity among

themselves, would rejoice the Protestants. Nothing was settled in this matter, and they then proceeded to deliberate upon which of the three subjects proposed to be discussed in the council (viz. the extirpation of heresy, the reformation of discipline, and the restoration of peace), should be first handled. Three prelates were appointed to examine the procuration papers and excuses of absent bishops. Trent, 1546.

In the next congregation the deliberations on the subject to be first proposed in the council were resumed. Some wished that the question of reform should be first opened; others, on the contrary, maintained that questions relating to the faith, as being at the root of all, demanded immediate notice. A third party, amongst whom was Thomas Campeggio, bishop of Feltri, asserted that the two questions of doctrine and reformation were inseparable, and must be treated of together: this latter opinion ultimately prevailed; but at the moment the sense of the assembly was so divided, that no decision was arrived at.

It was then resolved that congregations should in future be held twice a week.

In the congregation held January 22nd, the party in favour of entering at once upon the subject of reform was much increased, but the three legates continued their opposition to their scheme. Subsequently, however, they proposed that they should always take into consideration together one subject relating to the faith, and one relating to reform, bearing one upon the other.

On the 24th a curious dispute arose about the proper seal for the use of the council. Some desired that a new seal should be made; but the legates, upon the plea that there was no workman in Trent capable of executing the work, and that it would be necessary to send to Venice for the purpose, succeeded in having the seal of the first legate attached to the synodal letters.

In the third session a decree was read which declared that the council was resolved, after the example of the fathers, to commence their deliberations by reciting the confession of their faith. The creed was then read word for word, without addition, and the majority of the prelates having signified their acquiescence in the decree and its wording, the session was terminated. Session III. Feb. 4.

In a congress, held February 22nd, the legates proposed that the council should enter upon the subject

Trent, 1546. of the Holy Scriptures; and four doctrinal articles were presented, extracted by the theologians from the writings of Luther upon the subject of Holy Scripture, which they affirmed to be contrary to the orthodox faith.

1. That all the articles of the Christian faith, necessary to be believed, are contained in Holy Scripture; and that it is sacrilege to hold the oral traditions of the Church to be of equal authority with the Old and New Testament.

2. That only such books as the Jews acknowledged ought to be received into the canon of the Old Testament; and that the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of S. James, the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Second and third Epistles of S. John, the Epistle of S. Jude, and the Apocalypse, should be erased from the canon of the New Testament.

3. That the true sense of Holy Scripture is to be gained from the original text in which it was written, and that the Latin version is full of errors.

4. That Holy Scripture is easy to be understood, and clear, and that no gloss or commentary is needed, but only the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

The two first articles were debated in the four following congregations.

As to the first article, the fathers came to the decision that the Christian faith is contained partly in Holy Scripture and partly in the traditions of the Church. Upon the second article much discussion arose. All agreed in receiving all the books read in the Roman Church, including the Apocryphal books, alleging the authority of the catalogues drawn up in the councils of Laodicea and Carthage, and those under Innocentius I. and Gelasius I.; but there were four opinions as to the method to be observed in drawing up the catalogue. One party wished to divide the books into two classes, one containing those which have always been received without dispute, the other containing those which had been doubted. To authorize this, they brought forward the example of S. Austin, who made this distinction, and that of S. Gregory the Great, who asserts that the Books of Maccabees are not to be accounted canonical. The authority of S. Jerome and of Cardinal Cajetan was also adduced.

The second party desired a threefold division. 1. Containing the undoubted books. 2. Those which had

been at one time suspected, but since received (such as the six epistles rejected by Luther). 3. Those which had never been recognized, as seven of the Apocryphal books, and some chapters in Daniel and Esther. Trent, 1546.

The third party wished that no distinction should be made.

The fourth that all the books contained in the Latin Vulgate should be declared to be canonical and inspired.

The discussion was resumed on the 8th of March, but not decided: the fathers, however, unanimously agreed that the traditions of the Church are equal in authority to Holy Scripture.

In the following congregation it was decided that the catalogue of the books of Holy Scripture should be drawn up without any of the proposed distinctions, and that they should be declared to be all of equal authority.

The authority of the Latin Vulgate came under consideration in subsequent congregations, and it was, almost unanimously, declared to be authentic.

With regard to the fourth article, it was agreed that in interpreting Scripture men must be guided by the voice of the fathers and of the Church.

In the next session between sixty and seventy prelates attended. Two decrees were read. 1. Upon the canon of Scripture, which declares that the holy council receives all the books of the Old and New Testament, as well as all the traditions of the Church respecting faith and morals, as having proceeded from the lips of Jesus Christ Himself, or as having been dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continued succession, and that it looks upon both the written and unwritten Word with equal respect. After this the decree enumerates the books received as canonical by the Church of Rome, and as they are found in the Vulgate, and anathematizes all who refuse to acknowledge them as such. The second decree declares the authenticity of the Vulgate, forbids to interpret it contrary to the teaching of holy Church and the fathers, orders that extreme care be taken in printing it, forbids all profane uses of scriptural words and expressions, and directs that all who make such evil use of them, or employ them for superstitious purposes, shall be punished as profaners of the word of God. Session IV. April 8.

Subsequently, in another congregation, the abuses relating to lecturers on Holy Scripture and preachers

Trent, 1546. were discussed, also those arising from the non-residence of bishops [5].

After this, the question of original sin came under consideration, and nine articles taken from the Lutheran books were drawn up and offered for examination; upon which some discussion took place; ultimately, however, a decree was drawn up upon the subject, divided into five canons.

1. Treats of the personal sin of Adam.
2. Of the transmission of that sin to his posterity.
3. Of its remedy, *i. e.* holy baptism.
4. Of infant baptism.
5. Of the concupiscence which still remains in those who have been baptized.

A great dispute arose between the Franciscans and Dominicans concerning the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin; the Franciscans insisted that she should be specially declared to be free from the taint of original sin; the Dominicans, on the other hand, maintained that, although the Church had tolerated the opinion concerning the immaculate conception, it was sufficiently clear that the Virgin was not exempt from the common infection of our nature.

A decree of reformation, in two chapters, was also read.

Session V. June 17. In the fifth session the decree concerning original sin was read, containing the five canons mentioned above, enforced by anathemas. Afterwards the fathers declared that it was not their intention to include the blessed Virgin in this decree, and that upon this subject the constitutions of pope Sixtus IV. were to be followed.

In a congregation held June 18, they proceeded to consider the questions relating to grace and good works. Also the subject of residence of bishops and pastors was discussed; the cardinal del Monté and some of the fathers attributed the heresies and disturbances which had arisen to the non-residence of bishops, whilst many of the bishops maintained that they were to be at-

[5] The bishops complained of the privilege granted to the regulars by the popes, of preaching the word of God without their licence; the regulars, on the other hand, declared, that the non-residence and neglect of the bishops and inferior pastors had rendered this seeming interference on their part necessary; and further, that they had been called to the work by the popes, without any solicitation on their part.

tributed to the multitudes of friars and other privileged persons, whom the pope permitted to wander about and preach in spite of the bishops, who, in consequence, could do no good even if they were in residence. Trent, 1546.

In the congregation held June 30, twenty-five articles, drawn up from the Lutheran writings on the subject of justification, were proposed for examination, in order that those which were deemed censurable might be condemned. Some of these articles seem well to have merited the judgment passed upon them; thus, amongst others:

5. Declares that repentance for *past* sin is altogether unnecessary, if a man lead a new life.

7. The fear of hell is a sin, and makes the sinner worse.

8. Contrition arising from meditation upon, and sorrow for past sin, makes a man a great sinner.

11. Faith alone is required: the only sin is unbelief; other things are neither commanded nor forbidden.

12. He who has faith is free from the precepts of the law, and has no need of works in order to be saved; nothing that a believer can do is so sinful that it can either accuse or condemn him.

13. No sin separates from God's grace but want of faith.

14. Faith and works are contrary to one another; to teach the latter is to destroy the former, &c.

At this time the three ambassadors of the king of France arrived, viz. Dursé, Lignieres, and Pierre Danez. The last-mentioned delivered a long discourse, in the course of which he entreated the council to suffer no attack to be made upon the privileges of the kingdom and Church of France.

In a congregation held August 20, the subject of justification was again warmly discussed, as well as the doctrine of Luther concerning free-will and predestination.

Upon this latter subject nothing worthy of censure was found in the writings of Luther or in the Confession of Augsburg; but eight articles were drawn up for examination from the writings of the Zuinglians. Upon some of these there was much difference of opinion.

By the advice of the bishop of Sinagaglia, the canons drawn up embodying the decrees of the council were divided into two sets: one set, which they called the

Trent, 1547. *decrees of doctrine*, contained the Catholic faith upon the subjects decided; the others, called *canons*, stated, condemned, and anathematized, the doctrines contrary to that faith. These decrees were mainly composed by cardinal S. Croix, who bestowed infinite pains upon them: at least one hundred congregations were held upon the subject.

Afterwards they returned to the consideration of the reform of the Church, and to the question about episcopal residence. Most of the theologians present, especially the Dominicans, maintained that residence was a matter not merely canonically binding, but of Divine injunction. The Spaniards held the same opinion. The legates, seeing that the discussion tended to bring the papal authority and power into question, endeavoured to put a stop to it.

Session VI. Jan. 13. In the sixth session the decree concerning doctrine was read: it contained sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons against heretics. These chapters declare that sinners are brought into a state to receive justification when excited and helped by grace; and believing the word of God, they freely turn to God; believing all that He hath revealed and promised, especially that the sinner is justified by the grace of God, given unto him through the redemption of Jesus Christ; and when acknowledging their sinfulness, and filled with a salutary fear of God's justice, yet trusting to his mercy, they conceive hope and confidence that God will be favourable to them for the sake of Jesus Christ, and thereupon begin to love Him as the only source of all righteousness, and to turn from their sins through the hatred which they have conceived against them, *i. e.* through that repentance which all must feel before baptism; in short, when they resolve to be baptized, to lead a new life, and to follow the commandments of God.

After this, the decree explains the nature and the effects of justification, saying that it does not consist merely in the remission of sin, but also in sanctification and inward renewal. That the *final* cause of their justification is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, and eternal life; the *efficient* cause is God Himself, who, of his mercy, freely washeth and sanctifieth by the seal and unction of the Holy Spirit, who is the pledge of our inheritance; the *meritorious* cause is our Lord Jesus Christ,

his beloved and only Son, who, of his great love where- Trent, 1547.
with He loved us, merited justification for us, and by his holy passion made satisfaction to the Father for us, when we were yet enemies; and the *instrumental* cause is the sacrament of baptism, without which no one can be justified; and, finally, the *formal* cause is the righteousness of God given to each, not that righteousness by which He is righteous in Himself, but that by which He makes us righteous, *i. e.* with which being endued by Him, we become renewed in our hearts, and are not merely accounted righteous, but are made really so, by receiving, as it were, righteousness in ourselves, each according to the measure given unto us, at the will of the Holy Spirit, and in proportion to the proper disposition and co-operation of each: so that the sinner by means of this ineffable grace becomes truly righteous, a friend of God, and an heir of everlasting life; that it is the Holy Spirit who works this marvellous change in him by forming holy habits in his heart, habits of faith, hope, and charity, which unite him closely to Jesus Christ, and make of him a lively member of his Body. But that no man, although justified, is to imagine himself exempt from the observation of God's commandments. No man may dare, under pain of anathema, to utter such a rash notion, already condemned by the fathers, as that it is impossible for a man even after justification to keep God's commandments. Since God commands nothing impossible, but with the commandment He desires us to do all that we can, and to seek for aid and grace to enable us to fulfil that which in our natural strength we cannot do.

The council further teaches upon this subject, that no man may presume upon the mysterious subject of predestination, so as to assure himself of being amongst the number of the elect and predestinated to eternal life; as if, having been justified, it were impossible to commit sin again, or at least as if, falling into sin after justification, he must of necessity be raised again. That, without a special revelation from God, it is impossible to know who are those whom He hath chosen. It also teaches the same of the gift of perseverance, concerning which it declares that he who persevereth unto the end shall be saved; that it can be obtained only from the Almighty, who alone is able to keep him that standeth, and to raise up him that falleth. That no one in this life

Trent, 1547. can promise himself an absolute assurance of perseverance, although all ought to put entire confidence in God's assistance, who will finish and complete the good work which He hath begun in us, by working in us to will and to do, if we do not of ourselves fail of his grace.

Further, that they who by sin have fallen from grace given, and justification, may be justified again when God awakens them: and that this is done by means of the sacrament of penance, in which, through the merits of Jesus Christ, they may recover the grace which they have lost; that this is the proper method of recovery for those who have fallen. That it was for the benefit of those who fall into sin after baptism, that our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of penance, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained[6]." Whence it follows, that the repentance of a Christian fallen unto sin after baptism, is to be clearly distinguished from the repentance required at holy baptism; for it not alone requires him to cease from sin, and to view his vileness with horror, *i. e.* to have an humble and contrite heart; but it also implies the sacramental confession of his sin, at least in will, and the absolution of the priest, together with such satisfaction as he can make by means of fasting, alms-giving, prayer, and other pious works proper to a spiritual life. Not that any thing that he can do can help towards obtaining the remission of the *eternal* punishment due to sin, which is remitted together with the sin by the sacrament of penance (or by the desire to receive that sacrament where it cannot be had), but such satisfaction is necessary to attain remission of the *temporal* penalties attached to sin, which are not always remitted in the case of those who, ungrateful to God for the blessing which they have received, have grieved the Holy Spirit, and profaned the temple of God.

That this grace of justification may be lost, not only through the sin of infidelity, by which faith itself is lost, but also by every kind of mortal sin, even though faith be not lost. For the gospel excludes from the kingdom of God not only unbelievers, but believers also if they be "fornicators, or idolaters, or adulterers, or effeminate, or abusers of themselves with mankind, or thieves,

[6] S. John xx. 22, 23.

or covetous, or drunkards, or revilers, or extortioners[7],"
or guilty of any other mortal sin, for the punishment of which they are cut off from the grace of Jesus Christ. Trent, 1547.

These chapters were accompanied by thirty-three canons, which anathematize those who hold the opinions specified in them, contrary to the tenor of the doctrine contained in the chapters.

Besides this decree, another was published in this session, relating to the Reformation, containing five chapters upon the subject of residence. The council, after first exhorting bishops to watch over the flock committed to them, declares that they cannot possibly fulfil this duty, if, like mere hirelings, they forsake their sheep. The decree renews the ancient canons against non-resident prelates, and declares that every prelate, whatever be his dignity, being absent for six months together from his diocese, without just and sufficient cause, shall be deprived of the fourth part of his revenue; and that, if he remain away during the rest of the year, he shall lose another fourth: that if his absence be prolonged beyond this, the metropolitan shall be obliged, under pain of being interdicted from entering the church, to present him to the pope, who shall either punish him, or give his church to a more worthy shepherd; that if it be the metropolitan himself who is in fault, the oldest of his suffragans shall be obliged to present him. Several of the bishops present wished that the residence of bishops should be, in this decree, formally recognized by the council as a matter of divine obligation; but by the decision of the majority it passed in this form.

Secondly, the decree relates to the case of inferior prelates and clerks having benefices, and declares that the ordinary may compel residence, notwithstanding any privilege of perpetual non-residence which may be alleged.

The decree then goes on to treat, thirdly, of the reform of ecclesiastics, both secular and regular; fourthly, of the visitation of chapters by the ordinary; and, fifthly, it declares that bishops may not perform any episcopal function whatever out of their own dioceses, without the consent of the bishop of the place.

Before the seventh session, a congregation was held,

[7] 2 Cor. vi. 9, 10.

Trent, 1547. in which it was agreed to treat in the next place of the sacraments; and thirty-six articles, taken from the Lutheran books, were proposed for examination: after which thirty canons on the subject were drawn up, viz. thirteen on the sacraments in general, fourteen on baptism, and three on confirmation. They relate to their number, their necessity, excellence, the manner in which they confer grace, which they declared to be *ex opere operato*, i. e. that the sacraments confer grace upon all those recipients who do not, by mortal sin, offer a bar to its reception; e. g. grace is conferred by baptism upon infants, although they bring with them no pious affections; how they efface sin, the character which they imprint, the worthiness of the minister, the persons who may administer them, of the right of private individuals to change the form of the sacraments, and the intention of the minister, &c. They also drew up a decree, declaring that the sacraments ought always to be administered gratuitously [8].

After this the question of reformation was discussed; amongst other things it was debated whether a plurality of benefices requiring residence is forbidden by the divine law; for those who held residence to be a divine command denied to the pope the power of dispensing, the others maintained that residence is binding only by the authority of the canons.

Session VII. March 3. In the seventh session the thirty canons relating to the sacraments were read, together with the accompanying anathemas, viz. thirteen on the sacraments in general, fourteen on baptism, and three on confirmation.

1. Anathematizes those who maintain that the seven sacraments of the New Testament were not all instituted by Jesus Christ.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that any one sacrament is of more worth than another.

[8] According to Fra Paolo, it was a decree in six chapters; the first of which related to the gratuitous administration of the sacraments; the second ordered that baptism and confirmation should be administered only in churches; the third related to the administration of baptism; the fourth ordered that only one sponsor should be required at baptism and confirmation; the fifth ordered that, in order to prevent certain superstitious uses made of the baptismal water, it should not be taken out of the church; the sixth forbids the confirmation of persons in mortal sin, and others. Raynaldus is silent about this decree; and Pallavicinus denies it altogether.

8. Anathematizes those who deny that the sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*, i. e. by their own proper virtue. Trent, 1547.

9. Anathematizes those who deny that baptism, orders, and confirmation, imprint an ineffaceable character.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that all Christians, male and female, may preach God's word, and administer the sacraments.

11. Anathematizes those who deny that the intention of the minister to do what the Church does, is necessary to the effectual administration of the sacraments.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that the sin of the minister invalidates the sacrament.

13. Anathematizes those who maintain that the minister may change the prescribed form.

Amongst the fourteen canons on baptism:

2. Anathematizes those who assert that real and natural water is not necessary in baptism.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church of Rome, the mother and mistress of all Churches, does not teach the true doctrine on the subject of baptism.

4. Anathematizes those who deny the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, in the name of the blessed Trinity, and with the intention to do what the Church does.

5. Anathematizes those who maintain that baptism is not necessary to salvation.

7. Anathematizes those who maintain that the baptized need only believe, and not keep the law of God.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that sin after baptism is remitted by faith.

11. Anathematizes those who maintain that apostates from the faith should be again baptized.

12. Anathematizes those who maintain that no one ought to be baptized until he is of the age at which our Lord was baptized, or at the point of death.

13. Anathematizes those who deny that baptized infants are not to be reckoned amongst the faithful.

14. Anathematizes those who maintain that persons baptized in infancy should, when they come of age, be asked whether they are willing to ratify the promise made in their name.

Secondly, the decree of reformation, containing fifteen chapters: 1. Relates to the election of bishops. 2. Prohibits any one to hold more than one bishopric. 3. Relates to the choice of persons to be presented to

Trent, 1547. benefices. 4. Forbids the holding of two or more incompatible benefices. 5. Directs that persons holding such incompatible cures or benefices be compelled to show their dispensations. 6. Relates to the union of benefices. 7. Of perpetual vicars to serve united cures. 8. Of the visitation of exempt churches by their ordinaries. 9. Of the consecration of prelates. 10. Of the power of chapters to give letters dimissory during the vacancy of the see. 11. Of the permission necessary in order to be promoted to holy orders by another than one's own bishop. 12. Of dispensations in this case. 13. Of the examination of those to be presented to benefices. 14. Of the cognizance of causes concerning the exempt. 15. Of the jurisdiction of bishops over hospitals.

In a congregation which followed, the question of transferring the council to some other place was discussed, a report having been spread that a contagious disease had broken out in Trent.

Session VIII. March 11. Accordingly, in the eighth session, a decree was read, transferring the council to Bologna, which was approved by about two-thirds of the assembly; the rest, who were mostly Spaniards, or other subjects of the emperor, strongly opposed the translation. The matter was warmly debated, and the emperor complained much of the transfer of the council, and ordered the prelates who had opposed it to remain at Trent, which they did.

At Bologna, Session IX. April 21. In the first session held at Bologna, the legates and thirty-four bishops were present; a decree was read postponing all business to the next session, to be holden on the 2nd of June ensuing, in order to give time to the prelates to arrive.

Session X. June 2. On the 2nd of June, however, there were but six archbishops, thirty-six bishops, one abbot, and two generals of orders, present. It was deemed advisable to prorogue the session to the fifteenth of September ensuing; but the quarrel between the pope and the emperor having now assumed a more serious aspect, the council remained suspended for four years, in spite of the solicitations made by the German bishops to the pope that the sessions of the council might continue. The emperor on his side wished that the council should be brought back to Trent, and urged the pope on that head; but, finding his request unattended to, he pub-

lished a protest against the assembly at Bologna, upon the plea that the Germans could not attend it, the place being under the control of the pope. It was at this time that he caused the well-known formulary of faith to be drawn up, called the "Interim," composed by three theologians [9], and contained in twenty-six articles. This formulary, having received the sanction of the electors, was published, but gave satisfaction to neither party. Trent, 1551.

However, in 1549, Paul III. died, and the cardinal del Monté having been elected in his place, under the name of Julius III., he very shortly issued a bull, dated March 14, 1551, directing the re-establishment of the council of Trent, and naming as his legates, Marcellus Crescentio, cardinal, Sebastian Pighino, archbishop of Siponto, and Aloysius Lipomanes, bishop of Verona.

Accordingly, the next session was held at Trent, in May, 1551, when cardinal Crescentio caused a decree to be read, to the effect that the council was re-opened, and that the next session should be held on the 1st of September following. At Trent, Session XI. May 1. 1551.

In the next session, an exhortation was read in the name of the presidents of the council, in which the power and authority of œcumenical councils were extolled, and the fathers were exhorted to seek for God's assistance in prayer, and by leading an irreproachable life: then followed a decree declaring that the subject of the sacrament of the holy Eucharist should be treated of in the next session. Afterwards, the earl of Montfort, ambassador from the emperor, demanded to be admitted to the council; which was agreed to: moreover, James Amyot, the ambassador of Henry II. of France, presented a letter from his master, which, after some opposition, was read; it explained why no French bishop had been permitted to attend the council. Afterwards, Amyot, on the part of Henry, made a formal protest against the council of Trent, in which he complained of the conduct of Julius III. Session XII. Sept. 1.

In the congregation following, the question of the holy eucharist was treated of, and ten articles selected from the doctrine of Zuinglius and Luther were proposed for examination.

[9] Namely, Julius Pflug, Michael bishop of Sidon, and John Islebius.

Trent, 1551. 1. That the body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist only in a figure, not really.

2. That the Lord's body is eaten, not sacramentally, but only spiritually and by faith.

3. That no transubstantiation takes place in the eucharist, but a hypostatic union of the human nature of Christ with the bread and wine.

4. That the eucharist was instituted for the remission of sins only.

5. That Jesus Christ in the eucharist is not to be adored, and that to do so is to commit idolatry.

6. That the holy sacrament ought not to be kept; and that no person may communicate alone.

7. That the body of Christ is not in the fragments which remain after communion; but it is so present only during the time of receiving, and not afterwards.

8. That it is sin to refuse to the faithful the communion in both kinds.

9. That under one species is not contained the same as under both.

10. That faith alone is required in order to communicate; that confession ought to be voluntary, and that communion at Easter is not necessary.

It was ruled that the theologians, in giving their several opinions upon these articles, should be guided solely by the authority of Holy Scripture, apostolical tradition, the recognized councils, the constitutions of the sovereign pontiffs, the holy fathers, and the consent of the universal Church; that they should weigh their decisions so well, and be so careful in making choice of correct and proper terms, as not unnecessarily to shock the particular views of different theologians, but that they should endeavour to make use of expressions which could not offend the sentiments of either party, in order that thus the whole united force of the Catholic Church might be turned against the heretics. Nine of the most learned of the fathers were selected to prepare the decree.

In the subsequent congregations these articles were considered, and the decree, in eight chapters, was drawn up, and presented for examination and correction [1].

[1] Five canons, intended to remove certain abuses connected with the administration of the holy eucharist, were also drawn up in these congregations, but never published. They were to the following effect: that due veneration be paid by all persons at

In another congregation the question of reform was discussed, the subject of episcopal jurisdiction was brought forward, and a regulation drawn up upon appeals. No appeal from the judgment of the bishop and his officials was allowed, except in criminal cases, without interfering with civil judgments; and even in criminal cases, it was not permitted to appeal from interlocutory sentences, until a definitive sentence had been passed. The ancient right of the bishops to give sentence in the provincial synods was not, however, restored. Trent, 1551.

The power was left to the pope of judging, by means of commissioners delegated *in partibus*.

The decree concerning the doctrine of the holy eucharist was read on the 13th of September, and was contained in eight chapters. The council declares, in chapter 1, that after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God, and very Man, is verily, really, and substantially contained under the species of these sensible objects; that it is a sin to endeavour to put a metaphorical sense upon the words in which our Lord instituted the holy sacrament; that the Church has always believed the actual body and the actual blood, together with his soul and his divinity, to be present under the species of bread and wine after consecration. Session XIII. Oct. 11.

3. That each kind contains the same as they both together do, for that Jesus Christ is entire under the species of bread, and under the smallest particle of that species, as also under the species of wine, and under the smallest portion of it.

4. That in the consecration of the bread and wine, there is made a conversion and change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of our Lord's body, and a change of the whole substance of the wine into that of his blood, the which change has been fitly and properly termed "transubstantiation."

the elevation of the host, and when it is carried in procession; that it be kept in every parish church, with a lamp burning before it day and night; that it be renewed every fifteen days; that it be carried to the sick by a priest properly habited, and preceded by a light; that all curates should teach their people concerning the sacraments; that the canon "Omnis utriusque sexus" be enforced; that all ordinaries should look to the execution of these things.

Trent, 1551. 5. That the worship of Latria is rightly rendered by the faithful to the holy sacrament of the altar.

6. That the custom of keeping it in a consecrated place is as ancient as the time of the council of Nicea (canon 13); and that of carrying it to the sick is to be commended.

7. That the holier this sacrament is, the more care should be taken by all Christian men to approach it with suitable respect, remembering those fearful words of the apostle, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself;" that he ought, consequently, to "examine himself," and that no man who hath committed a mortal sin may presume to approach the holy eucharist, without having first made sacramental confession, &c.

8. That there are three modes of communicating: 1. Sacramentally, as in the case of sinners. 2. Spiritually, as they do who receive only in will and by faith. 3. Both sacramentally and spiritually, as they do who actually receive, and with faith and proper dispositions.

To this decree there were added eleven canons, anathematizing those who held certain heretical doctrines on the subject of the holy eucharist, and especially those contained in the ten articles proposed for examination in the congregation held September 2.

Thus, canon 1 condemns the opinion contained in the first of those articles.

2. That contained in article 3.
3. That contained in article 9.
4. That contained in article 7.
5. That contained in article 4.
6. That contained in article 5.
7. That contained in article 6.
8. That contained in article 2.
9. That contained in article 10.

10. Condemns those who deny that the priest may communicate alone.

11. Condemns those who maintain that faith alone, without confession, is a sufficient preparation for the communion.

Afterwards, a decree of reformation, containing eight chapters, was read; the subject of it was the jurisdiction of bishops. It reminds prelates, amongst other things, that they are appointed to feed the flock committed to them, and not to injure it; bids them conduct

themselves towards their inferiors without even the appearance of lording it over them, but as towards their children and brethren. Trent, 1551.

Chapter 1. Declares that in cases relating to visitations and corrections, and the capacity or incapacity of persons, and also to criminal matters, it shall not be lawful to appeal before the definitive sentence is given.

2. Declares that, in cases of appeal, the pope shall appoint judges *in partibus*, and that the commission shall always be directed to the metropolitan.

3. States that the appellant must lay before the judge to whom he has appealed the documents relating to the first judgment, which shall be furnished gratuitously.

4. Declares that bishops may proceed to the deposition and degradation of criminal ecclesiastics, if they have the assistance of so many abbots or dignified clergy as the canons heretofore required bishops.

5. Directs that the bishop shall take cognizance of the absolution of criminals against whom proceedings have been commenced, and shall nullify all absolutions, &c. obtained upon false pretences.

6. In order to avoid unnecessary odium, bishops shall not be called upon to appear personally at their judgments, unless it be a case involving the deposition of the party accused.

7. No witnesses against a bishop to be listened to unless they be of respectability and of good character; those who bear false witness, from hatred or other cause, to be rigorously punished.

8. Criminal cases relating to bishops, in which they must of necessity appear in person, to be sent to the pope for judgment.

In a congregation held after this session, twelve articles on the subjects of penance and extreme unction were examined, taken from the writings of Luther and his disciples in a subsequent congregation. The decrees and canons upon the subject were brought forward, together with a decree in fifteen chapters[2] on reform.

[2] The fifteenth chapter was negatived; it required that no benefice should in future be given to be holden *in commendam* to any person under the age required for holding such benefice as a title. Fra Paolo says, that the prelates rejected this, because it would have hindered them from resigning their benefices in favour of their relations. All the other chapters were agreed to in the next session.

Trent, 1551. Session XIV. Nov. 25.

In the fourteenth session the decree upon penance, in nine chapters, was read.

It states 1, that our Lord chiefly instituted the sacrament of penance when He breathed upon his disciples, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c.; and the council condemns those who refuse to acknowledge that by these words our Lord communicated to his apostles and to their successors the power of remitting or retaining sins committed after baptism, understanding them only of the power of preaching the word of God and the gospel of Jesus Christ.

2. That in this sacrament the priest exercises the function of judge; that it is only with many tears and with much labour, which the justice of God demands, that we can regain that total and perfect renewal which was wrought in us at our baptism; and that for this cause the holy fathers justly speak of penance as a laborious baptism.

3. The decree states that the form of the sacrament, in which its force and virtue resides, is contained in the words of the absolution pronounced by the priest, "Ego te absolvo," &c.; that the penitential acts are contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are, as it were, the matter of the sacrament, *i. e.* these exterior acts are instead of a sensible and permanent matter.

4. The council defines contrition to be an inward sorrow for and hatred of the sin committed, accompanied by a firm resolution to cease from it in future. It also states, that although sometimes contrition is made perfect by charity, and reconciles to God, without the actual reception of the sacrament of penance, yet that reconciliation is not to be attributed to contrition only, apart from the desire of receiving that sacrament, which is implied in contrition.

With respect to imperfect contrition, called attrition, arising merely from the shame and disgracefulness of sin, or from the fear of punishment, the council declares that if it be accompanied by a hope of forgiveness, and excludes the desire to commit sin, it is a gift of God, and a motion of the Holy Spirit; and that, far from rendering a man a hypocrite and a greater sinner, it disposes him (disponit) to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of penance.

This word "disponit" was substituted for "sufficit," which stood in the first draught of the decree.

5. The decree then goes on to establish the necessity of confessing in every mortal sin which, by diligent self-examination, can be brought to remembrance. With regard to venial sins it states, that it is not absolutely necessary to confess them, and that they may be expiated in many other ways. Trent, 1551.

6. As to the minister of this sacrament, it declares that the power of binding and loosing is, by Christ's appointment, in the priest only; that this power consists not merely in *declaring* the remission of sins, but in the judicial act by which they are remitted.

7. As to the reserved cases, it declares it to be important to the maintenance of good discipline, that certain atrocious crimes should not be absolved by every priest, but be reserved for the first order.

8. The decree further teaches, that in the matter of satisfaction, the acts imposed upon the penitent should be such as may serve as a remedy for and preservative against sin, to cure the disease of the soul; that the satisfaction which the priest imposes ought to be in proportion to the sin committed; that it is owing to the satisfaction made by Jesus Christ, that ours have any merit.

9. That we can make satisfaction to God not only by self-imposed inflictions, and by those which the priest prescribes, but also by bearing patiently and with a penitential spirit the temporal sorrows and afflictions which God sends to us.

In conformity with this decree, fifteen canons were published, condemning those who maintained the following doctrines:—

1. That penance is not a true sacrament of Jesus Christ.

2. That baptism is the real sacrament of penance.

3. That the words "*Quorum remiseritis peccata*," &c., are to be understood of the authority to preach the word.

4. That contrition, confession, and satisfaction, are not the matter of the sacrament of penance.

5. That contrition only makes man a hypocrite.

6. That sacramental confession is not necessary, and that auricular confession is an institution purely human.

7. That it is not necessary to confess every mortal and secret sin.

8. That such confession is impossible, and that an-

Trent, 1551. nual confession, as ordered by the council of Lateran, is not necessary.

9. That sacramental absolution is not a judicial act.

10. That priests in mortal sin have no power to bind and loose, and that this power is common to all the faithful.

11. That bishops have not the power to reserve certain cases for their own judgment.

12. That the whole penalty is remitted in this sacrament with the sin.

13. That we offer no satisfaction to God in bearing his inflictions patiently, or in imposing voluntary mortifications on ourselves.

14. That satisfactions do not do honour to God.

15. That the keys of the Church are only to loose, and not to bind.

After this, the decree upon the subject of extreme unction, in three chapters, was read. It states that this sacrament was looked upon by the Father as the consummation of penitence and of the whole Christian life, which ought to be a scene of continual penitence. That this unction was appointed by our Lord Jesus Christ as a true sacrament of the New Testament; that it is plainly recommended to the faithful by S. James, and that the use of it is insinuated by S. Mark. That the matter of the sacrament is the oil consecrated by the bishop, and that its form consists in the words pronounced when the unction is applied. 2. That its effect is to wipe out the remains of sin, and to reassure and comfort the soul of the sick person, by exciting within him a full confidence in God's mercy, and sometimes to restore the health of the body, when such renewed health can advantage the salvation of the soul. That bishops and priests alone may administer this sacrament. That this sacrament ought to be given to those who are in danger of death; but that if they recover, they may receive it again.

The council then agreed upon four canons on the subject, with anathema.

1. Anathematizes those who teach that extreme unction is not a true sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ.

2. Anathematizes those who teach that it does not confer grace, nor remit sin, nor comfort the sick.

3. Anathematizes those who teach that the Roman rite may be set at nought without sin.

4. Anathematizes those who teach that the πρεσβύτεροι, of whom S. James speaks, are old persons, and not priests. Trent, 1551.

After this the question of reform came before them, and fourteen chapters upon the subject of episcopal jurisdiction were published.

1. Forbids the granting of dispensations and permissions by the court of Rome to the prejudice of the bishop's authority.

2. Forbids bishops *in partibus infidelium*, upon the strength of their privileges to ordain any one under any pretext without the express permission of or letters dimissory from the ordinary.

3. Gives bishops power to suspend clerks ordained without proper examination, or without their licence.

4. Orders that all secular clerks whatever, and all regulars living out of their monasteries, shall be always, and in all cases, subject to the correction of the bishop in whose diocese they are, notwithstanding any privileges, exemption, &c., whatsoever.

5. Relates to the conservators [3].

6. Orders all clerks, under pain of suspension and deprivation, to wear the habit suited to their order, and forbids them the use of short garments, and green and red stockings.

7. Enacts that a clerk guilty of voluntary homicide shall be deprived of all ecclesiastical orders, benefices, &c.

8. Checks the interference of prelates in the dioceses of others.

9. Forbids the perpetual union of two churches situated in different dioceses.

10. Directs that benefices belonging to the regulars shall be given to regulars only.

11. Directs that no one shall be admitted to the religious life who will not promise to abide in the convent in subjection to the superior.

12. Declares that the right of patronage can be given only to those who have built a new church or chapel, or who endow one already built.

13. Forbids all patrons to make their presentation to

[3] Judges granted, in certain cases, by the pope, to parties who appealed to him, to look after their interests and to protect them; these conservators, however, often went so far beyond their duty, as to hinder the course of justice, in order to favour their clients.

Trent, 1552. any one but to the bishop, otherwise the presentation to be void.

In a congregation held December 23, the sacrament of orders was considered, and twelve articles taken from the Lutheran writings, were produced for examination. Subsequently eight canons were drawn up, condemning as heretics those who maintained the following propositions:—

1. That orders is not a true sacrament.
2. That the priesthood is the only order.
3. That there ought to be no hierarchy.
4. That the consent of the people is necessary to the validity of orders.
5. That there is no visible priesthood.
6. That unction is unnecessary.
7. That this sacrament does not confer the Holy Spirit.
8. That bishops are not by Divine appointment, nor superior to priests.

Session XV. Jan. 25. In the fifteenth session a decree was read, to the effect that the decrees upon the subject of the sacrifice of the mass and the sacrament of orders, which were to have been read in this session, would be deferred until March 19, in order that the Protestants, to whom a new safe conduct had been granted, might be able to attend.

In the following congregation the subject of marriage was treated of, and thirty-three articles thereon were submitted for examination.

The disputes which arose between the ambassadors of the emperor and the legates of the pope produced another cessation of the council. The Spanish bishops and those of the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, as well as all who were subjects of the emperor, wished to continue the council; but those, on the other hand, who were in the interests of the court of Rome, did all they could to prevent its continuance, and were not sorry when the report of a war between the emperor and Maurice, elector of Saxony, caused most of the bishops to leave Trent. In the meantime some Protestant theologians arrived, and urged the ambassadors of the emperor to obtain from the fathers of the council an answer to certain propositions, and to induce them to engage in a conference with them; both of which, however, the legates, upon various pretexts, eluded.

Trent, 1552. Session XVI. May 28.

The chief part of the prelates having then departed, the pope's bull, declaring the council to be suspended until peace and security should be re-established, was read in the sixteenth session. This suspension lasted for nearly ten years; but on the 29th November, 1560, a bull was published by Pius IV. (who succeeded to the papacy upon the death of Julius III. in 1555), for the re-assembling of the council at Trent on the following Easter Day, in which Pius named for his legates to the council Gonzago, cardinal of Mantua, and cardinal James Dupuy, of Nice, to whom he subsequently added three others.

Immediately after the publication of the bull, the pope despatched nuncios to the different courts of Europe, and, amongst others, to Elizabeth, queen of England, inviting her and the bishops of the English Church to the council. However, the nuncio (the abbot Jerome Martinengo) had not got farther than Flanders when he received an order from the queen, forbidding him to cross the sea; and although both the king of Spain and the duke of Alba did all in their power to induce her to listen to his message, and reminded her that he had been sent only in order that he might labour for the reunion of the Church of Christ in a general council, Elizabeth obstinately persisted in her refusal, declaring that she would have no intercourse with the bishop of Rome, whose authority had been banished from England by parliament. A nuncio was also sent to the czar of Moscovy. From various causes the re-opening of the council did not take place until the year 1562.

Session XVII. Jan. 18, 1562.

On the 18th of January in that year the seventeenth session was held; one hundred and twelve bishops and several theologians being present. The bull of convocation and a decree for the continuation of the council were read; the words "*proponentibus legatis*," inserted in it, passed in spite of the opposition of four Spanish bishops, who represented that the clause, being a novelty, ought not to be admitted, and that it was, moreover, injurious to the authority of œcumenical councils.

In a congregation held January 27, the legates proposed the examination of the books of heretics and the answers to them composed by Catholic authors, and requested the fathers to take into their consideration the construction of a catalogue of prohibited works. Some

Trent, 1562. discussion arose about the propriety of examining in council the works to be prohibited. In a congregation held February 11, leave was given to the legates to nominate the fathers who should draw up the decree for the next session, and to form a congregation for the index of prohibited books.

Session XVIII. Feb. 26. In the next session the pope's brief was read, who left to the council the care of drawing up a list of prohibited books. After which a decree upon the subject of the books to be prohibited was read, inviting all persons interested in the question to come to the council, and promising them a hearing.

In congregations held on the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of March, they deliberated about granting a safe conduct to the Protestants, and a decree upon the subject was drawn up.

On the 11th of March a general congregation was held, in which twelve articles of reform were proposed for examination, which were discussed in subsequent congregations.

The first article, upon residence, gave rise to great disputes; the fathers were divided upon the question, whether residence is binding by the Divine law or not; a question which the pope was anxious should not be discussed at all: since, according to contemporary historians, he conceived that his dignity might be endangered by it. The archbishop of Grenada strongly supported that view of the question which regards residence as ordered by the Divine law, and the event proved that such was the sentiment of the majority[4].

2. Whether it should be ordered that in future no one should be ordained without a benefice as a title? many frauds having been discovered in the matter of patrimonial titles.

3. Whether any thing ought to be paid for ordination to the bishop or his officers?

4. Whether authority should be given to prelates to convert some prebends into daily distributions in places where there were no such distributions?

[4] The numbers were sixty-eight for the declaration of the divine obligation of residence, and thirty-three against it; or, according to Pallavicinus, seventy placets and thirty-eight non-placets. This article was, nevertheless, by the influence of the legates, withdrawn for a time.

5. Whether several titles should be allowed in large parishes requiring many priests? Trent, 1562.

6. Whether small cures might be united?

7. What measures should be taken with vicious and ignorant curates?

8. Whether authority should be given to ordinaries to reunite to the mother church ruined chapelries, which, for want of funds, could not be restored?

9. Whether ordinaries should have authority to visit benefices in commendam, belonging to the regulars?

10. Whether clandestine marriages should for the future be declared null?

11. What marriages should be regarded as clandestine?

12. What remedy should be applied to the abuses caused by the mendicant friars?

In the nineteenth session nothing whatever passed requiring notice, the publication of the decrees was postponed to the following session. Immediately after this session the French ambassadors arrived, and their instructions were curious, and to the following effect:— Session XIX. May 14.

That the decisions which had taken place should not be reserved for the pope's approval, but that the pope should be compelled to submit to the decision of the council. That they should begin with the reform of the Church in its head, and in its members, as had been promised at the council of Constance, and in that of Basle, but never completed. That annates should be abolished, that all archbishops and bishops should be obliged to residence, that the council should make arrangements with respect to dispensations, so as to remove the necessity of sending to Rome. That the 6th canon of Chalcedon should be observed, which prohibits bishops to ordain priests without appointing them to some specific charges, so as to prevent the increase of useless ministers, &c. &c. &c.

On the 26th May, a congregation was held to receive the Ambassador of France. The Sieur de Pibrac, in the name of the king his master, in a long discourse, exhorted the prelates to labour at the work of reformation, promising that the king would, if needful, support and defend them in the enjoyment of their liberty.

In the 20th session, the promoter of the council replied to the discourse delivered by Pibrac in the last congregation; after which a decree was read, proroguing the session to the 16th July. Session XX. June 4.

Trent, 1562. In the following congregation five articles upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist were proposed for examination.

1. Whether the faithful are, by God's command, obliged to receive in both kinds?

2. Whether Jesus Christ is received entire under one species as under both?

3. Whether the reason which induced the Church to give the communion to the laity under one kind only, still obliged her not to grant the cup to any one?

4. Upon what conditions the cup should be permitted to any persons, supposing it to be advisable to grant it?

5. Whether the communion is necessary to children under years of discretion[5]?

The question about the obligation of residence was also again mooted: but the cardinal of Mantua objected to its discussion as entirely alien from the subject before them, promising, at the same time, that it should be discussed at a fitting season. In subsequent congregations held from the 9th to the 23rd of June, the subject of the five articles was discussed[6]. Four canons were drawn up upon the subject of communion in both kinds. In a congregation held July 3, the French Ambassadors presented a memorial exhorting the fathers, as the imperialists had already done, to concede the cup to the laity. They said that in matters of positive right, like the question before them, it behoved them to give way at the right time, and not to cause a scandal by appearing so pertinacious in observing the commandments of men, and so negligent of those of God. They concluded by begging the council so to word their decree, as not to prejudice the right of the kings of France to communicate in both kinds on the day of their consecration, nor the use enjoyed in some monasteries of the Cistercian order in the kingdom of doing the same.

In a congregation held July 14th, the decree in four

[5] Paolo mentions six articles, the second of which is to the effect, "Had the Church sufficient grounds for refusing the cup to the laity, or did she err?" Neither Pallavicinus nor Raynaldus notices this article.

[6] Amongst the *sufficient grounds* alleged for denying the cup to the laity, was (according to Paolo) one which we should rather have expected to find in the mouth of a Protestant churchwarden than of a Catholic prelate, viz. *the expense of providing wine* in many places.

chapters on the communion was examined. In the first it is endeavoured to be shown that those passages of holy Scripture which are adduced in favor of communion in both kinds do not prove the necessity of it. That our Lord, (in the 6th S. John) by speaking one while of the necessity of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, and at another, of eating His flesh only, shows that the latter is sufficient. Trent, 1562.

On the 21st session, the four chapters on doctrine were read, in which the council declared, that neither laymen nor ecclesiastics (not consecrating) are bound by any divine precept to receive the sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds; that the sufficiency of communion in one kind cannot be doubted, without injury to faith. Further, that the Church has always possessed the power of establishing and changing in the dispensation of the sacraments (without, however, interfering with essentials) according as she has judged to be most conducive to the honor due to the holy sacrament, and to the good of the recipients, taking into account the diversities of place and conjuncture; that although Jesus Christ instituted and gave to His apostles the sacrament under two kinds, it is necessary to believe that under either kind Jesus Christ is received whole and entire; and that no diminution is experienced in any of the graces conveyed by the sacrament. Lastly, that children not arrived at years of discretion are not obliged to receive the eucharist; since having been regenerated in the water of baptism, and so incorporated in Jesus Christ, they are incapable at their tender years of losing the gift, so bestowed upon them, of being the children of God. Four canons in conformity with this doctrine were then read: Session XXI. July 16.

1. Against those who maintain that all the faithful are under an obligation to receive in both kinds.

2. Against those who maintain that the Church hath not sufficient grounds for refusing the cup to the laity.

3. Against those who deny that our Lord is received entire under each species.

4. Against those who maintain that the eucharist is necessary to children before they come to the exercise of their reason.

Subsequently nine chapters on reform were read.

1. Enacts that bishops shall, on no pretext whatever, receive any fee for conferring orders, giving letters di-

Trent, 1562. missory, &c. &c. That their registrar shall not ask more than the tenth of a crown of gold for their fee.

2. Forbids to ordain any one, without a sufficient title.

3. Provides for the service of cathedrals and collegiate churches with small revenue.

4. Provides for an increase of curates, or subdivision of parishes, in very populous or very extended districts.

5. Permits bishops in certain cases to unite parishes in perpetuity.

6. Enacts that bishops shall provide ignorant clerks, having cure of souls, with vicars or curates, to whom a certain portion of the revenue of the benefice shall be assigned; that they shall suspend irregular livers, and deprive those who continue obstinately in evil.

7. Provides for the reunion of decayed chapels with the mother church.

8. Orders the annual visitation of all benefices, even of those held in commendam.

9. Provides for the entire suppression of the mendicant orders, and enacts that indulgences shall be published by the ordinary, assisted by two of the chapter.

A few days after this session, the Italian bishops received a letter from the pope, in which he declared that he was far from wishing to hinder the discussion of the question concerning the nature of the obligation to residence; that he desired the council to enjoy entire freedom, and that every one should speak according as his conscience directed him; at the same time, however, he wrote to his nuncio Visconti[7], bidding him take secure measures for stifling the discussion, and for sending it to the holy see for decision.

In the congregations held after the twenty-first session, the question was concerning the sacrifice of the mass. All the legates, the ambassadors of the emperor, of the king of France, and of the Venetian states, were present, with one hundred and fifty-seven prelates, about one hundred theologians, and nearly two thousand other persons: thirteen articles were proposed for consideration.

1. Whether the sacrifice of the mass be a true sacri-

[7] Charles Visconti, bishop of Vintimille, was sent about this time by the pope to Trent, to overlook the proceedings of the legates, and especially of the cardinal of Mantua, with whom the pope was much displeased.

fice, or merely a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross? Trent, 1562.

2. Whether it be not false to assert that the sacrifice of the mass derogates from that of the cross?

3. Whether by the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," Jesus Christ ordered his apostles to offer his Body and his Blood in the mass?

4. Whether the sacrifice of the mass avails others besides those who receive it; whether it may not also profit the dead and the living; and whether it may not be offered as a satisfaction for sin?

5. Whether it be not false to assert that solitary masses are unlawful?

6. Whether it be not false to assert that it is contrary to the institution of Jesus Christ to mix water with the wine?

7. Whether it be not false to assert that the canon of the mass contains any errors, and that it ought to be abrogated?

8. Whether it be not false to assert that the Roman use of pronouncing the words of consecration in secret is to be condemned?

9. Whether it be not false to assert that mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue?

10. Whether it be not false to assert that it is an abuse to say masses in honour of any particular saint?

11. Whether it be not false to assert that any retrenchment ought to be made in the ceremonies, vestments, &c., ordered by the Church to be used in the celebration of mass?

12. Whether to say that Jesus Christ is mystically sacrificed for us, is the same thing as to say that He is given us to eat?

13. Whether the mass is merely a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a real sacrifice for the living and the dead?

All the theologians agreed, unanimously, that the mass ought to be regarded as a true sacrifice under the new covenant, in which Jesus Christ is offered under the sacramental species. One of their arguments was this, that Jesus Christ was priest after the order of Melchisedec, the latter offered bread and wine, and that, consequently, the priesthood of Jesus Christ includes a sacrifice of bread and wine.

In a congregation held about the 18th of August, the

Trent, 1562. archbishop of Prague presented a letter from the emperor, in which he made earnest entreaties that the cup might be conceded to the laity. This being rather a delicate subject, it was reserved for special consideration in a subsequent congregation.

The decree on the subject of the sacrifice of the mass being now completed, the fathers began next to consider the subject of communion in both kinds. Three opinions principally prevailed amongst the prelates; 1, was to refuse the cup entirely; 2, to grant it upon certain conditions to be approved of by the council; and 3, to leave the settlement of the matter to the pope. The Spanish and Venetian bishops supported the first opinion.

Amongst those who were inclined to grant the cup was cardinal Madrucio, who endeavoured to prove that the council possessed the power to grant the petition, and that they clearly ought to do so; that the council of Basle had already afforded a precedent in yielding the use of the cup to the Bohemians; that by giving way on this point they would be the means of bringing back many heretics from their errors, and of hindering Catholics from forsaking the Church.

Amongst other prelates who spoke in favour of giving the cup to the laity was the bishop of Modena, who was followed by Gaspard Capal, bishop of Leira, who urged that those who refused the cup were merely supported by the authority of later times, whereas they who were for yielding it had on their side all antiquity, the authority of the council of Basle, and that of pope Paul III. But amongst the strongest advocates for granting the petition was the bishop of the Five Churches, who implored the prelates to have compassion on the Churches, and to pay some regard to the pressing entreaties of the emperor, who, he averred, never spoke of the matter without tears, so great was his desire to see peace restored to the Church, and ended a long speech by repeating what he had said in a former congregation, that it had been better that the council had never been convoked, than that it should refuse to yield the cup; for that multitudes of persons had hitherto been kept in obedience to the pope in the hope of receiving this boon, who, if it were at last denied to them, would, without doubt, forsake the Church. On the other hand, the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, and

the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, were in favour of refusing; the latter maintained that by giving way to them, the people would be rather confirmed in the error of supposing that the body only of our Lord is contained under the species of bread, and the blood only under that of wine; that if they gave way now, other nations would require the same, and they would go further, and would next require the abolition of images, as being an occasion of idolatry to the people. Other bishops, supporting this opinion, reminded the assembly that the Church had been led to forbid the use of the cup from a fear lest the consecrated wine should be spilled or turn sour, and that the former accident could hardly be prevented when the holy sacrament was carried long distances and by bad paths. The archbishop of Rossano, the bishops of Cava, Almeria, Imola, and Rieti, with Richard, abbot of Préval, at Genoa, were also amongst those who spoke in favour of absolutely refusing the cup. Trent, 1562.

Osio, bishop of Rieti, spoke most strongly on the subject; he said that councils had ever taken a course the very reverse of that pointed out by heretics; that, for example, when certain Jews insisted that the new converts should observe Jewish ceremonials, the apostles forbade them, and abolished the use of them: that when Nestorius had advanced the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin is the mother of Jesus Christ, but not the Mother of God, the council at once declared that in future the Blessed Mary should be styled the Mother of God; that when the Bohemians demanded the concession of the cup at the council of Constance, it was denied to them; that the authority of the council of Basle could not be brought forward, since experience had proved that the Church had gained nothing by the concession there made, which had but served to render the heretics more insolent.

Others, who preferred half measures, were for leaving the decision to the pope, which was the result which the legates themselves laboured hard to obtain, for they neither desired that the demand for the cup should be absolutely negatived (which would undoubtedly have been the case had it been left to the decision of the council), for then the emperor would have been enraged; nor did they wish that the concession of the cup

Trent, 1562. should appear to be so much the act of the council, as of the pope personally. Eventually they won over some to their views, both from those who desired absolutely to refuse, and from those who approved of giving the cup; and on the eve of the twenty-second session a decree passed, by which it was left to the pope to act as he thought best in the matter, the numbers being ninety-eight for the decree, and thirty-eight against it. The discussion lasted altogether from the 15th of August to the 16th of September.

Session XXII. Sept. 17. In the twenty-second session, one hundred and eighty prelates, with the ambassadors and legates, were present. The doctrinal decree touching the sacrifice of the mass, in nine chapters, was published. It was to the following effect:

1. That although our Lord once offered Himself to God the Father in dying upon the altar of his cross, in order to obtain thereby eternal redemption for us, nevertheless, since his priesthood did not cease at his death, in order that He might leave with his Church a visible sacrifice (such as the nature of man requires), by means of which the bloody sacrifice of the cross might be represented, at the Last Supper, on the same night that He was betrayed, in the execution of His office as a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, He offered his Body and Blood to the Father under the species of bread and wine, and gave the same to his Apostles, and by these words, "This do in remembrance of me," He commanded them and their successors to offer the like sacrifice, as the Catholic Church has always believed and taught.

2. As the same Jesus Christ, who once offered Himself upon the cross with the shedding of his blood, is contained and immolated without the effusion of blood in the holy sacrifice of the mass, this latter sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by it we obtain mercy and forgiveness; since it is the same Jesus Christ who was offered upon the cross, who is still offered by the ministry of his priests; the only difference being in the *manner* of offering. And that the mass may be offered, not only for the sins and wants of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who, being dead, are not yet made pure.

3. Although the Church sometimes celebrates masses

in honor and in memory of the saints, the sacrifice is still offered to God alone, for she only implores their protection. Trent, 1562.

4. That the Church for many ages past has established the sacred canon of the mass, which is pure and free from every error, and contains nothing which is not consistent with holiness and piety, being in truth composed from our Lord's words, the traditions of the apostles, and the pious institutions of the holy popes.

5. That the Church, in order the better to set forth the majesty of so great a sacrifice, has established certain customs; such as saying some things at mass in a low voice, others aloud; and has introduced certain ceremonies,—as the benediction, lights, incense, ornaments, &c., after the tradition of the apostles.

6. That although it is to be desired that at every mass all the faithful should communicate, not only spiritually, but also sacramentally, nevertheless the council does not condemn private masses, in which the priest only communicates, but, on the contrary, approves and authorizes them, for that they are celebrated by the proper minister in behalf of himself and the faithful.

7. That the Church hath ordained that the priest shall mix water with the wine, because there is reason to believe that our Blessed Lord did so, and because both Blood and Water issued from his side; which sacred mystery, by the use of this mixture, is remembered.

8. Although the mass contains much to edify the people, the fathers did not judge it right that it should be celebrated in the vulgar tongue[8], and the Roman Church has preserved the use; nevertheless, the clergy should at times, and especially on festivals, explain to the people some part of what they have read to them.

9. Anathematizes, in nine canons, all those who deny the affirmative of twelve of the thirteen articles proposed in the congregation following the twenty-first session, viz. the 1st, 3rd, 13th, and 4th, 2nd, 10th, 7th, 11th, 5th, 8th and 9th, and 6th (which see).

Then followed a decree concerning what should be ob-

[8] Courayer observes, that the mention made of the fathers here is unfortunate, since it is certain that all the original liturgies were composed in the language of the country in which they were first used; *e. g.* the Greek, Roman, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and others.

Trent, 1562. served or avoided in the celebration of mass. Bishops were ordered to forbid and abolish every thing which had been introduced through avarice, irreverence, or superstition, such as pecuniary agreements for the first masses, and forced exactions made under the name of alms; vagabond and unknown priests were forbidden to celebrate, also those who were notorious evil livers; no masses were to be said in private houses; all music of an impure and lascivious character was forbidden in churches, and all worldly conversation, profane actions, walking about, &c. Priests were forbidden to say mass out of the prescribed hours, and otherwise than Church form prescribed. It was also ordered to warn the people to come to church on Sundays and holidays at least.

In the third place the decree of reformation was read, containing eleven chapters.

1. Orders that all the decrees of the popes and the councils relating to the life, morals, and acquirements of the clergy, should be in future observed, under the original and even greater penalties.

2. Enacts that bishoprics shall be given only to those persons who possess the qualifications required by the canons, and who have been at least six months in holy orders.

3. Permits bishops to appropriate the third part of the revenue of the prebends in any cathedral or collegiate church, for daily distributions; to be given in such a manner that those who fail to attend service shall lose their share in the distributions for that day; and if they continue to absent themselves, they shall be proceeded against according to the canons.

4. Declares that no one under the rank of subdeacon shall have any voice in the chapter; that all the members shall perform their proper offices.

5. Enacts that dispensations "extra curiam" (*i. e.* granted any where out of the court of Rome) shall be addressed to the ordinary, and shall have no effect until he shall have testified that they have not been obtained surreptitiously.

6. Treats of the care to be observed in proving wills.

7. Orders that legates, nuncios, patriarchs, and other superior judges, shall observe the constitution of Innocentius IV., beginning "*Romana*," whether in receiving appeals, or granting prohibitions.

8. Orders that bishops, as the delegates of the holy

see, shall be the executors of all pious gifts, whether by will or otherwise; that to them it appertains to visit hospitals and other similar communities, except those under the immediate protection of the king. Trent, 1562.

9. Directs that those to whom the care of any sacred fabric is entrusted, whether laymen or clerks, shall be held bound to give account of their administration yearly to the ordinary, unless the original foundation require them to account to any other.

10. Declares that bishops may examine notaries, and forbid them the exercise of their office in ecclesiastical matters.

11. Enacts penalties against those who usurp or keep possession of the property of the Church, and pronounces anathemas against them.

With respect to the concession of the cup to the laity, the council declared, by another decree, that it judged it convenient to leave the decision to the pope, who would act in the matter according as his wisdom should direct him.

In a congregation certain articles relating to the reformation of morals were discussed, and the theologians were instructed to examine eight articles on the subject of the sacrament of orders.

1. Whether orders is a true sacrament instituted by Christ?

2. Whether the priest's ordination is the only sacrament, and whether the inferior orders are only steps to the priesthood?

3. Whether there is in the Catholic Church a hierarchy composed of the episcopate, priesthood, and the other orders? whether all Christians are priests? whether the consent of the people is necessary to ordination? whether a priest can return to the lay condition?

4. Whether in the New Testament there is a visible priesthood with power to consecrate and offer the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and to remit sin; or whether the priesthood means merely the ministry of God's word?

5. Whether the Holy Spirit is given in ordination? whether ordination confers a character?

6. Whether the unction and other ceremonies used in ordination are necessary?

7. Whether bishops are superior to priests? whether

Trent, 1562. they alone have the power of confirming and ordaining? whether persons not canonically ordained are true ministers?

8. Whether bishops, called and ordained by the pope's authority, are lawful bishops? and whether they who are made bishops in any other way, and without a canonical institution, are true bishops?

This occupied many congregations; in one of which a large number of the prelates, chiefly Spaniards, demanded that there should be added to the 7th canon, concerning the institution of bishops, a clause declaring the episcopate to be of Divine right.

An attempt was made to stifle the discussion, but John Fonséca, a Spanish theologian, amongst others, entered boldly upon the subject, declaring that it was not, and could not be forbidden to speak upon the matter. He maintained that bishops were instituted by Jesus Christ, and that by Divine right, and not merely by a right conferred by the pope; that they were superior to priests; that as it was believed that Christ instituted the papacy when He said to S. Peter, "I will give to thee the keys," &c., so must it be believed that He instituted the episcopate when He said to the other apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c.; consequently, as the pope is the successor of S. Peter, so are the bishops the successors of the other apostles. He then proved his position by a multitude of passages taken from the fathers, and cited a long passage from S. Bernard, as well as Acts xx. 28. Further, he showed that although bishops were created or confirmed by the pope, this was no more a proof that they did not derive their institution and authority from Jesus Christ, than the creation of the pope himself by the cardinals, was a proof that he did not derive his authority from God. To all which he added many other arguments.

The discussion of this question proved highly disagreeable at Rome, and the legates received instructions on no account to permit it to be brought to a decision.

However, in subsequent congregations the dispute was renewed with warmth: in the congregation of the 13th October, the archbishop of Granada insisted upon the recognition of the institution of bishops, and their superiority to priests, *Jure Divino:* and alleged the words of S. Dionysius [9], who teaches that the order of

[9] From a work falsely ascribed to him.

deacons is subject to that of priests, the order of priests to that of bishops, and the order of bishops to Jesus Christ, the Bishop of bishops; also a passage from S. Cyprian, who, in his Epistle to Rogatianus, declares that "bishops are created by God Himself;" and another in his book on the Unity of the Church, viz. "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur." In short, he declared that the pope was bishop in precisely the same manner as other bishops, and that he and all other bishops were brethren, the children of the same Father, which is God, and of the same Mother, which is the Church. Trent, 1562.

The same view was taken in the following congregation by the archbishop of Braga and the bishop of Segovia, who declared that it was clear from ecclesiastical history and the epistles of the Fathers, that as the primitive bishops gave an account to one another of the proceedings in their several churches, for the approval of their brethren, so the popes made the very same sort of report of what had passed at Rome, and that all the popes up to the time of Sylvester had acknowledged the Divine right of bishops. No less than fifty-three prelates, out of one hundred and thirty-one present, voted in favour of the recognition of the Divine institution and jurisdiction of bishops. According to Paolo, the number amounted to fifty-nine. The dispute was, however, by no means ended. On the 20th the Jesuit Lainez, at the instigation of the legates, delivered a powerful speech in opposition to the view taken by the Spanish bishops, denying altogether that the institution and jurisdiction of bishops were of Divine right: "If," said he, "bishops have received any jurisdiction from Jesus Christ, they are all equal in rank and authority, and every thing else; and all distinction between patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops is annihilated; and the pope can no more interfere with their jurisdiction to restrain or to do away with it." A most just conclusion, in which lay the secret cause of all the violent opposition made by the Ultra-Montane party to the demand of the Spaniards.

However, powerful as was the speech of Lainez, he was answered by the bishop of Paris so effectually, that the legates, to their great discomposure, saw the views of the Spanish prelates gain ground. The latter then declared formally that unless their demand was granted,

Treht, 1562. and the order and jurisdiction of bishops declared in the canon to be "*Jure Divino*," they would thenceforth absent themselves from all the congregations and sessions.

In the meantime the cardinal of Lorraine arrived at Trent with several French prelates, and was received with honour. In a congregation held on the 23rd of November, he read the letter of the king of France to the council, in which he strongly urged them to labour sincerely to bring about a sound reformation of abuses, and to restore its pristine glory to the Catholic Church by bringing back all Christian people to one religion. After the letter was finished the cardinal delivered a speech, strongly urging the necessity of proceeding speedily with the work of reformation, in which he was followed by Du Ferrier, the king's ambassador, who spoke his mind freely.

All this time so little progress had been made with the canons and decrees, that when the 26th of November, the day fixed for holding the 23rd session, arrived, it was found necessary to prorogue it. After this, in the following congregations the subject of the Divine right of bishops was again discussed, when the French bishops declared in favour of the views held by the Spaniards. Much time was consumed upon this question and upon that of residence, to the great disgust of the cardinal of Lorraine and others, who desired that the subject of reformation should be at once gone into.

1563. At the beginning of the year 1563 the French ambassadors presented their articles of reformation, under thirty-two heads. Their principal demands were as follows:—

6. That no person should be appointed bishop unless he were of advanced age, and of good character and capacity.

7. That no curates should be nominated unless they were of good character and abilities.

9. That bishops, either personally or by deputy, should preach on every Sunday and Festivals, besides Lent and Advent.

10. That all curates should do the same, when they had a sufficient audience.

12. That incapable bishops, abbots, and curates, should resign their benefices, or appoint coadjutors.

14. That all pluralities whatever should be abolished,

without any consideration of compatibility or incompatibility. Trent, 1563.

16. That steps should be taken to provide every beneficed clerk with a revenue sufficient to maintain two curates, and to exercise hospitality.

17. That the Gospel should be explained to the people at mass, and that after mass the priest should pray with the people in the vulgar tongue.

18. That the ancient decretals of pope Leo and Gelasius on communion in both kinds should be re-established.

19. That the efficacy of the sacrament should be also explained to the people before their administration.

20. That benefices should be conferred by bishops within six months; after which time they should devolve to the immediate superior, and so gradually to the pope.

21. That they should abolish, as contrary to the canons, all expectatives, regressions (returning to a benefice which has been once resigned), resignations, &c.

23. That simple priories should be reunited to the cure of souls, originally intended by the foundation, which had been separated from them, and assigned to perpetual vicars with miserable pittances.

27. That bishops should take in hand no matter of importance without the advice of their chapters; and that canons should be compelled to continual residence.

31. That no sentence of excommunication should be passed until three monitions had been issued, and then only for grievous faults. That bishops should be desired to give benefices rather to those who drew back from receiving than to such as sought for them.

32. That diocesan synods should be assembled at least once a year, provincial synods every three years, and general councils every ten years.

The pope, in order to elude the difficulty in which he was placed by the demand of the Spanish and French bishops, that the Divine right of bishops should be inserted in the 7th chapter, sent a form for the approval of the council, in which it was declared that "bishops held the principal place in the Church, but in dependance upon the pope." This, however, did not meet with approval, and, after a long contest, it was agreed to state it thus—that "they held the principal

Trent, 1563. place in the Church *under the pope*," instead of in dependance upon him.

However, a still warmer contest arose upon the chapter in which it was said that the pope had authority to feed and govern the Universal Church. This the Gallican and Spanish bishops would by no means consent to, alleging that the Church is the first tribunal under Christ, and that even S. Peter himself was sent to the Church as to his judge by our Saviour, when He said to him, "tell it to the Church[1]," &c. Accordingly, they insisted that the words "*Universas Ecclesias*," "all Churches," should be substituted for "*Universam Ecclesiam*;" "for," said the archbishop of Granada, "I am the bishop of Granada, and the pope is archbishop of it:" meaning that he permitted to the pope the same right of superintendence over particular Churches which an archbishop possesses over his suffragan bishops. The Italians, who warmly opposed this view, alleged the œcumenical authority of the council of Florence, as establishing the doctrine of the chapter; whilst the French denied both the œcumenicity and the legality of the council of Florence, and appealed to the councils of Constance and Basle; the former of which the Italians rejected as having been only approved in part, whilst the latter they scouted as schismatic.

The Gallicans even more strenuously denied that "the pope possessed all the authority of Jesus Christ," notwithstanding all the limitations and explanations which were added to it.

On the 5th of February the legates proposed for consideration eight articles on the subject of marriage, extracted from heretical books.

1. That marriage is not a sacrament instituted by God.

2. That parents may annul marriages contracted by their children clandestinely.

3. That a man may marry again during the life of his first wife, divorced on account of fornication.

4. That polygamy is allowed to Christians, and that to forbid marriages at certain seasons is a heathen superstition.

5. That marriage is to be preferred to the state of virginity.

[1] Matt. xviii. 17.

6. That priests in the Western Church may marry notwithstanding their vow. Trent, 1563.

7. That the degrees of consanguinity and affinity laid down in Leviticus xviii. are to be observed, and no others.

8. That the cognizance of causes relating to marriages belongs to the secular prince.

These articles were discussed in several congregations.

The sixth article came under consideration on the 4th of March; all agreed in condemning it as heretical, but they were divided upon the grounds of their opinion; some maintained that neither the Eastern nor Western Church had ever permitted priests, after ordination, to marry, and that this custom was founded upon apostolical tradition, not upon any ecclesiastical constitution or vow; others, on the contrary, maintained that marriage was forbidden to the secular clergy on account of their ordination, and by the ecclesiastical law, and to the regulars by their solemn vow, but that the pope had power to dispense with this probibition in certain cases; moreover, that up to the time of Innocentius II., a priest, by marrying, was only deprived of his ministry, whilst his marriage was held to be valid.

The question was afterwards discussed, whether it was advisable, under the circumstances of the times, to remove the restriction laid upon the clergy not to marry? this was in consequence of a demand to that effect made by the duke of Bavaria. Strong opposition was made to this demand, and many blamed the legates for permitting the discussion, and maintained that if this licence were granted the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy would fall to pieces, and the pope be reduced to the simple condition of bishop of Rome; since the clergy, having their affections set upon their families and country, would be inevitably detached from that close dependance upon the holy see, in which its present strength mainly consists.

In the meantime, the cardinal of Mantua had died, and the pope despatched two new legates to the council, cardinal Moron and cardinal Navagier. The French continued their importunities on the subject of reformation, and were as constantly put off upon one pretext or another, by the legates, and thus much time was wasted. The chief difficulties in their way were these:—1. The

Trent, 1563. decree already made, which gave the right of *proposing* to the legates only. 2. The question of the Divine obligation of residence. 3. The Divine institution of bishops. 4. The authority of the pope. And 5. The general question of reformation. As to the articles upon the latter subject proposed by the French ambassadors, the pope positively refused to allow them to be discussed; accordingly, about this time, the French, wearied with the proceedings, began to withdraw from the council.

In a congregation held May 10, a letter from the queen of Scots was read, in which she expressed her sorrow that she had not one Catholic prelate in her dominions whom she could send to the council, and declared her determination, should she ever attain to the crown of England, to do all in her power to bring that kingdom, as well as Scotland, back to the Roman obedience.

All this time the contests about the institution and jurisdiction of bishops, and the Divine obligation of residence, continued; and at last, in order to accommodate matters, and bring things to an end, it was resolved to omit altogether all notice of the institution of bishops, and of the authority of the pope, and to erase from the decree concerning residence whatever was obnoxious to either party. They then fell to work upon the decree concerning the reformation of abuses, and at last, on the 15th of July, the twenty-third session was held. 208 prelates, besides the legates and other ecclesiastics, were present, with the ambassadors of France, Spain, Portugal, &c. The sermon was preached by the bishop of Paris, who seems to have contrived in it to give offence to all parties. After the sermon, the bulls authorizing Moron and Navagier to act as legates for the pope were read, together with the letters of the king of Poland, the duke of Savoy, and the queen of Scotland. Lastly, the decrees and canons drawn up during the past congregation were brought before the council.

Session XXIII. July 15.

First, The decree upon the sacrament of orders, in four chapters, was read; it was to the effect, 1. That it is necessary to recognize in the Church a visible and outward priesthood, which has taken the place of the former priesthood. That both Holy Scripture and tradition teach us that it was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave to his apostles and their successors the power

of consecrating, of offering, and administeriug, his body and blood; and that of remitting and retaining sin. 2. That for the good order of the Church, it is necessary that there should be divers orders of ministers consecrated to the service of the altar. That Holy Scripture speaks not only of priests, but also of deacons, and that from the very beginning of the Church the names and functions of the other orders have been in use. 3. That orders is one of the seven sacraments of the Holy Church, because that the grace of order is conferred in ordination by means of the word used, and the outward sign. 4. That this sacrament confers a character which can never be effaced. That the bishops who have succeeded to the apostles belong in the chief place to the order of the hierarchy, that they have been appointed by the Holy Spirit for the government of the Church of God; that they are superior to priests, and can perform certain functions which the latter cannot. That those who having been elected and appointed by the people only, or by some secular power, take upon themselves this ministry without ordination, are to be regarded as thieves, and not as true ministers of the Church. Trent, 1563.

Then were published eight Canons on the Sacrament of orders, which anathematized,

1. Those who deny a visible priesthood in the Church.

2. Those who maintain that the priesthood is the only order.

3. Those who deny that ordination is a true sacrament.

4. Those who deny that the Holy Spirit is conferred by ordination.

5. Those who deny that the unction given at ordination is necessary.

6. Those who deny that there is a hierarchy composed of bishops, priests, and ministers, in the Catholic Church.

7. Those who deny the superiority of bishops to priests, or that they alone can perform certain functions which priests cannot, and those who maintain that orders conferred without the consent of the people are void.

8. Those who deny that bishops called by the authority of the pope, *qui auctoritate Romani pontificis assumuntur*, are true and lawful bishops.

Trent, 1563. After this, the decree of reformation was read, containing eighteen chapters:

1. Relates to the much-contested question of residence, and is of great length. The residence of bishops is strongly insisted upon, since the Divine command to all who have any charge of souls is, that they shall know their sheep, offer the sacrifice for them, nourish them with the bread of the Word of God, &c.; and since it is not possible to fulfil these duties except they be present with their flocks, the council declares that all who have the government of Churches, whether patriarchs, primates, bishops, &c., and even cardinals, shall reside in person, without ever absenting themselves for any length of time, unless some necessity, or the evident advantage of the Church or State require it, in which cases even they may not absent themselves without the written permission of the pope, or of the metropolitan, or one of his oldest suffragans. That if any one shall absent himself contrary to the enactments of this decree, he will offend mortally against God, and cannot, with a clear conscience, touch the revenue of his preferment for the period of his absence, but shall be obliged to expend such revenue in building churches, or in alms to the poor of the place.

Although the Divine obligation of residence is not openly declared in this decree, it is plainly to be inferred from it, and proves such to have been the opinion of the majority of bishops present.

This chapter, moreover, orders the residence of the inferior clergy, and directs that, when necessity compels their absence, they shall take care to supply their place by a sufficient curate, approved by the bishop, to whom they shall assign a proper stipend.

2. Orders the consecration, within three months, of all persons presented to cathedral or superior churches, under pain of being compelled to pay back the revenue they have received during that period; and orders that if they delay their consecration for three months longer they shall be deprived.

3. Directs that bishops shall themselves confer orders on their own clergy. If they be unable, they shall not send candidates to other bishops for ordination, without previous examination.

4. Forbids to admit to the first tonsure persons who

have not been confirmed and instructed in the first principles of the faith, and those who cannot read and write, &c. Trent, 1563.

5. Orders that candidates for minor orders shall bring a testimonial from their curate and schoolmaster. Those who aspire to higher orders shall wait upon the bishop one month before ordination, who shall publish their names in full church, and require information concerning their birth, morals, and manner of life.

6. Declares that no clerk, under 14 years of age, can hold a benefice, and orders the observance of the constitution of Bonifacius VIII. "*Clerici qui cum unicis,*" in the matter of married clerks.

7. Orders the careful examination of candidates for orders.

8. Directs bishops to confer orders only at the canonical seasons, in the cathedral church, and in the presence of the canons. No one to be ordained except by his own bishop, or with letters dimissory from him.

9. Forbids bishops to confer orders on any of their domestics not belonging to their diocese, except they have been with them three years.

10. Forbids abbots, notwithstanding any privilege, to give the first tonsure, or minor orders, to any, except to those under their jurisdiction (under pain of suspension).

11. Forbids to confer minor orders upon those who are ignorant of Latin.

12. Forbids to promote any one to the rank of sub-deacon, under twenty-two years; to that of deacon, under twenty-three; and to that of priest under twenty-five.

13. Requires that persons to be received into the orders of sub-deacon, or deacon, shall produce testimonials of having conducted themselves well in the inferior orders, and shall declare, that with God's help, they are capable of living in continence.

14. Forbids to admit any one to the priesthood who has not served, at least one year, as a deacon, unless, in the bishop's opinion, the good of the Church requires it. Orders bishops to take care that priests observe, at least, the Sundays and festivals, by celebrating mass, &c.

15. Forbids a priest, not having cure of souls, to hear confessions without the bishop's express permission.

Trent, 1563.

16. Renews the sixth canon of Chalcedon.

17. Orders that the several functions belonging to the different orders of clerks, from that of porter to that of deacon, shall be, in future, performed by the proper clerks.

18. Orders that in every cathedral church, a certain number of children belonging to the diocese shall be instructed in the ecclesiastical profession. Stipulates that they be born in lawful wedlock, and be not under twelve years of age, and capable of reading and writing.

In the following congregations the decrees concerning marriage were discussed, and it was unanimously agreed that the law of celibacy should be continued binding upon the clergy.

Moreover, twenty articles of reformation, which the legates proposed, were examined; and during the discussion, letters were received from the king of France, in which he declared his disappointment at the meagre measure of ecclesiastical reform proposed in these articles, and his extreme dissatisfaction at the chapter interfering with the rights of princes. Shortly after, nine of the French bishops returned home, so that fourteen only remained.

On the 22d of September, a congregation was held, in which the ambassador Du Ferrier spoke so warmly of the utter insufficiency of the articles of reform which the legates had proposed, and of their conduct altogether, that the congregation broke up suddenly in some confusion.

To fill up the time intervening before the twenty-fourth session, the subjects of indulgences, purgatory, and the worship of saints and images, was introduced for discussion, in order that decrees on the subject might be prepared for presentation in the twenty-fifth session. The cardinal of Lorraine having now returned from Rome, whither he had gone to concert measures with the pope, for settling those questions which had all along hindered the progress of the council, all parties seemed to be equally desirous to bring matters to a close, and the final business of the council was as much precipitated, as its deliberations hitherto had been delayed and protracted. On the 11th of November, the 24th session was held, in which the decree of doctrine, and the canons relating to the sacrament of marriage, were read.

Session XXIV. Nov. 11.

First, the decree containing the catholic doctrine on

the subject; after establishing the indissolubility of the marriage tie, by Holy Scripture, it adds, that Jesus Christ, by his passion, merited the grace necessary to confirm and sanctify the union betwixt man and wife. That the apostle means us to understand this, when he says, "Husbands love your wives, as Jesus Christ loved the Church;" and shortly after, "This sacrament is great; I speak of Jesus Christ and the Church[9]." Marriage, under the Gospel, is declared to be a more excellent state than that of marriage under the former dispensation, on account of the grace conferred by it, and that, accordingly, the holy fathers, councils, and universal tradition, rightly teach us to reckon marriage amongst the sacraments of the new law. Trent, 1563.

Then followed twelve canons, with anathemas, upon the subject.

1. Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is not a true sacrament.

2. Anathematizes those who maintain that polygamy is permitted to Christians.

3. Anathematizes those who maintain that marriage is unlawful only within the degrees specified in Leviticus.

4. Anathematizes those who deny that the Church has power to add to the impediments to marriage.

5. Anathematizes those who maintain that the marriage tie is broken by heresy, ill-conduct, or voluntary absence on either side.

6. Anathematizes those who deny that a marriage contracted, but not consummated, is annulled by either of the parties taking the religious vows.

7. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in holding that the marriage tie is not broken by adultery.

8. Anathematizes those who maintain that the Church errs in separating married persons for a time, in particular cases.

9. Anathematizes those who maintain that men in holy orders, or persons who have taken the religious vow, may marry.

10. Anathematizes those who maintain that the married state is preferable to that of virginity.

11. Anathematizes those who maintain that it is superstitious to forbid marriages at certain seasons.

[9] Eph. v. 32.

Trent, 1563. 12. Anathematizes those who maintain that the cognizance of matrimonial causes does not belong to the ecclesiastical authorities.

After this, a decree of reformation was published, relating to the same sacrament, containing ten chapters.

1. Refers to the subject of clandestine marriages, declares that the Church views such with horror, and hath always forbidden them; orders curates to publish the names of the parties about to contract marriage, on three consecutive festivals, in church, during the solemn mass; orders that two or three witnesses be present at the marriage, and declares all marriages to be null which are not solemnized in the presence of the clergyman of the parish, or of some other priest, having his permission, or that of the ordinary.

The council also exhorts the bride and bridegroom not to dwell together until they have received the benediction of the priest, and to confess carefully, and receive with devotion the holy Eucharist before marriage.

2. Treats of the impediments to marriage, which were in some respects relaxed, *i. e.* the impediments to marriage between a godparent and godchild and the parents of the godchild, was removed; also that between the person administering baptism and the person baptized, or his or her parents.

3 and 4. Also refer to the relaxation of impediments.

5. Those who wilfully contract marriage within the prohibited degrees are sentenced to be separated without any hope of obtaining a dispensation. Dispensations are ordered to be given rarely, if ever, and if given, only for a lawful cause. Dispensations to the second degree never to be granted unless to princes for the public good.

6. No marriage to be allowed between a ravisher and the woman ravished whilst she remains in his power; if, however, when at liberty, she consents, they may be married. The ravisher, and all aiding and abetting, to be, nevertheless, excommunicated.

7. Care to be used in permitting wanderers to receive the sacrament of marriage.

8. Fornicators, whether married or single, to be excommunicated, unless they will put away their mistresses after three monitions. The women, after three

monitions, to be driven out of the diocese unless they obey. Trent, 1563.

9. Forbids all masters, magistrates, &c., under anathema, to compel those under their control to marry against their own inclinations.

10. Confirms the ancient prohibitions to celebrate marriages between Advent and Epiphany, and between Ash-Wednesday and the octave of Easter.

After this a decree, containing twenty-one articles, upon the reform of the clergy was read.

1. Relates to the election of bishops and cardinals.

2. Directs that provincial councils shall be held at least every three years by the metropolitan or the oldest suffragan. Diocesan synods annually.

3. Orders that bishops shall visit their dioceses annually, or at least every three years, either in person or by deputy; that metropolitans shall not visit their suffragans except for reasons to be approved in the provincial council. Treats of the duties of inferior ordinaries when visiting, and directs that all visitors shall be careful not to be burdensome, and shall be content with frugal and modest entertainment. Also forbids patrons to interfere with the spiritual concerns of their churches.

4. Orders bishops to preach either in person or by deputy. Orders that sermons shall be preached either by the minister or his deputy in all parish churches every Sunday and holiday, and thrice a week during Advent and Lent.

5. Directs that criminal cases relating to bishops shall be judged at Rome.

6. Allows of dispensations in certain cases for secret sins.

7. Orders that the nature of the holy sacraments shall be explained to the people before they are administered to them.

8. Orders that open offenders shall be put to open penance, but allows to the bishop the power of imposing secret penance instead.

9. Extends the decrees made in the council relating to exempt benefices to extra diocesan benefices.

10. Declares that, in matters relating to visitations and the correction of morals, no claim of exemption or of appeal shall suspend the execution of the sentence.

11. Declares that such titles as that of prothonotary,

Trent, 1563.

count palatine, royal chaplain, &c., shall not exempt the holder from the bishop's jurisdiction.

12. Relates to the age at which persons may be advanced to certain dignities, and restricts some to persons holding certain academical degrees.

13. Permits bishops to provide for poor benefices having cure of souls, either by uniting them, or by assigning first fruits or tithes to them, or by the contributions of the parishioners. Forbids to annex parish churches to monasteries.

14. Declares that the council abhors the practice of paying any thing for a title or for taking possession.

15. Allows the bishop to diminish the number of prebends in poor cathedral establishments.

16. Ordains that the chapter shall elect a vicar-general within eight days after the death of their bishop, to look after the concerns of the church during the vacancy.

17. Forbids pluralities.

18. Relates to the filling up of vacant cures.

19. Suppresses altogether expectative graces, mental reservations, &c.

20. Orders that all ecclesiastical causes shall be tried in the first place before the ordinary, and that no appeal shall be allowed except from the definitive sentence; relates, further, to the trial of matrimonial causes, &c.

21. Relates to the words "Proponentibus Legatis" inserted in the decree of the first session, and declares that it was not the intention of the council thereby to depart from the ordinary manner of treating matters in general councils, or to give or take away any privilege from or to any person.

Session XXV. and last, Dec. 3rd and 4th.

The last session was held on the 3rd December, 1563; in it the decrees concerning purgatory, the invocation of saints, and the worship of images and relics were read.

1. Of purgatory. Declares that the Catholic Church, following Holy Scripture and tradition, has always taught, and still teaches, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls which are detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful and by the sacrifice of the mass. Orders all bishops to teach and to cause to be taught the true doctrine on this subject, without amusing the people with subtilties.

2. Of the invocation of saints. Orders bishops and others concerned in the teaching of the people, to instruct them concerning the invocation of saints, the honour due to their relics, and the lawful use of images, according to the doctrine of the Church, the consent of the fathers, and the decrees of the councils; to teach them that the saints offer up prayers for men, and that it is useful to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers and help. It further condemns those who maintain that the saints in rest ought not to be invoked, that they do not pray for men, that it is idolatry to invoke them, that it is contrary to Holy Scripture, &c., and that their relics and their tombs ought not to be venerated. Trent, 1563.

On the subject of images, the council teaches that those of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and of the saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honour is thus reflected upon those whom they represent; by means of these representations the people are instructed in the mysteries of the faith, and by thus seeing the good deeds of the saints are led to bless God, and endeavour themselves to do likewise.

The council then proceeds to anathematize all who hold or teach any contrary doctrine.

Lastly, in order to remedy abuses, it declares that if in any scriptural painting the Divinity is represented under any figure, the people should be warned that it is not intended that the Divinity can be seen by mortal eyes; further, that all things tending to superstition in the invocation of saints, the worship of their relics, and the right use of images, should be done away with; that care should be taken not to profane the festivals of the saints, &c.; that no new miracles or relics should be admitted without the bishop's consent, and that any other abuses should be rectified by the bishop and provincial council.

These decrees were followed by one of reformation, consisting of twenty-two chapters, which relate to the regulars.

1. Orders that all shall observe the rule of their profession.

2. Forbids any regular to hold any sort of property.

3. Permits all monasteries, except those of the Ca-

Trent, 1563. puchins and Franciscan Observantines [9], to hold property.

4. Forbids the religious to enter the service of any person, or to quit their convent without permission of the superior.

5. Charges that nuns shall strictly keep within their bounds, and forbids any nun to leave the convent, and any other person to enter it without the bishop's permission.

6. Of the election of superiors.

7. Superiors of nunneries to be at least forty years of age, and eight years of profession.

8. Of monasteries under the immediate jurisdiction of the holy see.

9. Orders that nunneries under the immediate jurisdiction of the holy see, shall be governed by the bishops.

10. Orders that the religious shall make confession, and communicate once a month.

11. Orders that in cases in which monasteries have parishes annexed to them, those who have charge of them shall be subject to the bishop in every thing relating to the ministration of the sacraments, except the monastery of Clugny, those in which the generals of orders reside, and those whose abbots possess episcopal or temporal jurisdiction.

12. Directs that regulars shall publish and observe the censures, interdicts, &c., ordered by the pope and the bishops.

13. Of cases of precedency.

14. Directs that regulars guilty of any public scandal, shall be punished by the superior within the time prescribed by the bishop.

15. Every profession made before sixteen years of age, and one of noviciate, to be null.

16. No engagements, &c., to be binding unless made within the last two months of the noviciate, and with the bishop's permission; at the end of the noviciate the novice to be either sent out of the house, or admitted to profession at once.

17. No woman to take the veil until the bishop, or some one by him appointed, hath examined her as to her willingness, &c.

[9] An offset of the Franciscans, founded by S. Bernardine of Sens, in 1419.

18. Excommunicates those who force women to take the veil against their will. Trent, 1563.

19. No complaints made by any one against the validity of his profession to be listened to unless made within the first five years.

20. The heads of orders to visit the monasteries committed to them.

21. Of the re-establishment of discipline.

22. Submits all regulars whatever to the enactments of this decree.

After this another decree, in twenty-one chapters, on general reformation, was read.

1. Of the duties of bishops: exhorts them to be modest and frugal in their way of living, and not to enrich their relatives with Church property.

2. Directs that the decrees of this council shall be received by every bishop in the first provincial council, and that the bishops shall promise obedience to the pope, and anathematize every heresy condemned by the council. Orders the same with respect to all beneficed men and universities.

3. Of excommunications.

4. Allows bishops in synod and the heads of monastic orders to act as they shall consider most conducive to the glory of God and the good of the Church, where the number of endowed masses is so great that they cannot be duly performed.

5. Relates to collations to benefices.

6. Relates to cases of episcopal proceedings against canons.

7. Is directed against the hereditary possession of benefices.

8. Exhorts all clerks to hospitality, and relates further to the conduct of governors of hospitals.

9. Of the right of patronage, forbids to sell such right, and to unite benefices.

10. Orders four persons in every province to be elected, who shall judge ecclesiastical causes delegated to them by the legates of the holy see.

11. Forbids to let out ecclesiastical property to farm upon consideration of any payment in advance, to the prejudice of successors.

12. Declares tithe to be of Divine appointment, and those who refuse it to be guilty of robbery, and excommunicated. Exhorts the faithful to give part of their

Trent, 1563. property to the endowment of poor bishoprics and churches.

13. Enacts that all dues on account of funerals paid to the cathedral or parish church, which may have been diverted to the use of hospitals or other pious institutions, shall in future revert to the Church.

14. Forbids clerks to retain concubines or women of suspected reputation, either in their houses or villages, under pain of being deprived of a third of the revenue of their benefice after the first monition, of losing all the fruits of it after the second, and of being for ever deprived of it if they continue obstinate after the third. Orders that if after obeying, they return to their wicked course of life, they shall be excommunicated. Also provides for the punishment of unbeneficed clerks and bishops.

15. Enacts that the bastards of clerks shall be unable to serve in or to hold the churches which their fathers have served in or held.

16. Forbids to convert cures into simple benefices.

17. Reprobates the servility of certain bishops, who conducted themselves in a time-serving and fawning manner towards great men and the king's officers, such as giving place to them in church, &c.; orders all bishops to abstain from such meanness.

18. Orders all the faithful to obey the sacred canons.

19. Insists upon the total cessation, throughout Christendom, of the detestable custom of duelling, which it declares to have been introduced by Satan for the ruin of souls. Enacts that all emperors, kings, princes, and other lords, granting a spot of ground for a duel, shall be, *ipso facto*, excommunicated, and deprived of the lordship of the town or place in which they permitted the duel. Sentences the duellists and their seconds to excommunication, loss of property, and perpetual infamy; and if either of the parties shall die in the encounter, forbids him Christian burial. Also excommunicates the instigators, abettors, and even spectators of a duel.

20. Declares that the council looks to princes to support the Church in all her rights, and to take care that their subjects shew due respect to the clergy; exhorts princes to observe the canons of the Church and the constitutions of the pope. Renews all canons and con-

stitutions made in favour of the liberty and immunities of the clergy and the Church. Trent, 1563.

21. Declares that whatsoever clauses and words are contained in the decrees of reformation made under the sovereign pontiffs, Paul, Julius, and Pius, all are to be so understood, as that the authority of the holy see remains always untouched and entire.

A decree was also published upon the subject of indulgences, to this effect, that the Church, having received from Jesus Christ the power to grant indulgences, and having, through all ages, used that power, the council declares that their use shall be retained, as being very salutary to Christian persons, and approved by the holy councils; it then anathematizes all who maintain that indulgences are useless, or that the Church has no power to grant them. At the same time, it desires that the ancient custom of the Church be adhered to, and that they be granted with care and moderation, forbidding all trafficking in them.

Further, the council exhorted all pastors to recommend to the observance of all the faithful, whatever had been ordered by the Church of Rome, established in this, or in any one of the œcumenical councils, and to impress upon them especially the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church.

The lists of books to be proscribed was referred to the pope, as also were the catechism, missal, and breviaries.

Then the secretary, standing up in the midst of the assembly, demanded of the fathers whether they were of opinion that the council should be concluded, and that the legates should request the pope's confirmation of the decrees, &c. The answer in the affirmative was unanimous, with the exception of three. The cardinal president Moron, then dissolved the assembly amidst loud acclamations.

In a congregation held on the following Sunday, the fathers affixed their signatures, to the number of two hundred and fifty-five; viz. four legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, thirty-nine proctors, seven abbots, and several generals of orders.[1]

[1] Chifflet, in his Conc. Trid. Can. et Decreta, 12mo, Paris, 1824, states the number of prelates present from the different nations to have been as follows :—

Confirmed. Jan. 6, 1564.

The acts of the council were confirmed by a bull, bearing date Jan. 6, 1564. The Venetians were the first to receive the Tridentine decrees. The kings of France, Spain, Portugal, and Poland, also received them, and they were published and received in Flanders, in the kingdom of Naples, and Sicily, in part of Germany, in Hungary, Austria, Dalmatia, and some part of South America; also amongst the Maronites. The Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, Russia, Greece, Syria, Egypt, &c. &c. reject the authority of this council.

In France, the council of Trent is received generally as to doctrine, but not altogether as to discipline. Various regulations which were deemed incompatible with the usages of the kingdom, the liberties of the Gallican Church, the concordat, and the just authority of the king, were rejected.—*Paolo Sarpi, Hist. of Council of Trent, by Courayer.* Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 725.

Trenton, New Jersey, 1801.

TRENTON. Held in September, 1801. Bishop White presiding in the house of bishops. A letter from bishop Provost having been read, stating that he had resigned the episcopal office, the question of the admissibility of such a resignation was discussed. In this convention, the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England were adopted, with certain verbal alterations adapted to the local circumstances of the American Church.—*Bishop White, Memoirs,* p. 31.

Treves, 948.

TREVES. [*Concilium Trevirense.*] Held in 948. The legate Marinus, the archbishop of Treves, and several bishops, here excommunicated Hugo, count of Paris, and two pretended bishops, made by Hugo, the pseudo-archbishop of Rheims. See C. INGELHEIM, A. D. 948. Tom. ix. Conc. p. 632.

Italians		187	Brought forward		260
By proctors		2	Greeks		6
		189	Poles		2
French		26	Hungarians		2
By proctor		1	English		1*
		27	Irish		3
Germans		2	Flemings		2
By proctors		4	Croatians		1
		6	Moravians		1
Spaniards		31	Illyricans		3
By proctors		4			231
		35			
Portuguese		3			
		260			

* Thomas Goduolus, bishop of S. Asaph.

TREVES. Held in 1548, by John, count of Isembourg, archbishop of Treves, who presided. Ten chapters, and a decree against the concubinary clergy were published.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 606. Treves, 1548.

TREVES. Held by John, archbishop of Treves, in 1549. Twenty canons were published. Treves, 1549.

1. Forbids to believe, hold, or teach, any other than the Roman doctrine.

2, 3, 4. Of preachers.

6. Orders that the hours be duly said by clerks, and that those who cannot attend at the time in the choir, shall say them privately.

9. Of the celebration of the mass.

10. Provides for lessening the number of festivals, and gives a list of those which shall in any case be retained.

11, 12. Of the religious and their houses.

15. Of schools.

17, 18. Of the immunity of churches.

19. Of the life and conversation of the clergy.

20. Provides that the heads of monasteries and colleges, and others of the clergy, shall be supplied with a copy of these canons.—Tom. xiv. Conc. p. 705.

TRIBUR. [*Concilium Triburense.*] Held in 895, at Tribur, a royal residence near Mayence. Twenty-two bishops were present, including Hatho, archbishop of Mayence, Herman, archbishop of Cologne, and Ratbode, archbishop of Treves. King Arnulphus also attended, with many of the chief lords of his kingdom. Fifty-eight canons were published. Tribur, on the Rhine, 895.

3. Declares, that, with the king's consent, it is ordered to all his nobles to seize those who refused to perform the penance due to their offences, and to bring them before the bishop.

4. Regulates the manner of disposing of the pecuniary mulct inflicted for wounding a priest; if the latter survived, the whole belonged to him, if he died, it was to be divided into three parts; one for his church, one for his bishop, and one for his relations.

5. Imposes five years' penance for killing a priest, during which time the penitent might not eat meat nor drink wine, except on Sundays and festivals. At the end of the five years, he might be admitted into the Church, but not to communion, until the expiration of

other five years, during which he was to fast three days in the week.

10. Renews the canon of the council of Carthage, which enacts that a bishop shall not be deposed by fewer than twelve bishops; a priest by fewer than six; nor a deacon by fewer than three.

12. Restricts the solemn celebration of baptism to Easter and Whitsuntide.

13. Orders the division of tithe into four portions; 1, for the bishop, 2, for the clerk, 3, for the poor, and 4, for the fabric.

15. Orders that the dead be buried, if possible, at the cathedral church; if not, at the church belonging to a monastery, in order that they might benefit by the prayers of the monks, otherwise in the church to which they paid tithe.

16. Proves from Scripture[2], that no fee may be taken for burials.

17. Forbids to bury laymen within the church.

18. Forbids chalices and patens of wood.

19. Orders that water be mixed with the wine in the chalice, but that there be twice as much wine as water[3].

30. Orders all due respect to the see of Rome[4], and enacts penalties against those who cause the death of Christians by enchantments.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 438.

Tribur, 1076. TRIBUR. Held in October, 1076. The pope's legates, with several German lords and some bishops, assembled in council, debated concerning the deposition of the emperor Henry IV., in consequence of which, he passed into Italy, and after the most humiliating concessions, obtained absolution from the pope, Jan. 25, 1077.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 355.

Trim, 1291. TRIM. Held on the Sunday after St. Matthew's day, 1291. Nicholas McMotissa, archbishop of Armagh, presiding. The four archbishops, all the suffra-

[2] Eccles. vii. Gen. iii.

[3] "Non debet enim ut a patribus accepimus et ipsa ratio docet, in calice Domini aut vinum solum, aut aqua sola offerri, sed utrumque permixtum, quia utrumque ex latere ejus profluxit."—*Pope Alexander*, quoted in the Canon.

[4] "In memoriam beati Petri Apostoli, honoremus sanctam R. et A. sedem, ut quæ nobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis, esse debeat magistra eccl. rationis. Quare servanda est cum mansuetudine humilitas, ut *licet vix ferendum ab illa sancta sede imponatur jugum*, conferamus et pie devotione toleremus," &c. &c.

gan bishops, all the cathedral chapters, by their deputies, and the other orders and degrees of the clergy, unanimously agreed in this synod to maintain and defend each other, in all courts, and before all judges, ecclesiastical or secular, against all lay encroachments upon, and violations of, their rights, liberties, or customs; and further, amply to indemnify those of their messengers, executors of their orders, &c., who might receive loss or damage in the performance of their duty.

Other articles of agreement were drawn up, pledging them to mutual co-operation in enforcing sentences of excommunication, &c.—*Bishop Mant, Hist. Irish Church*, p. 17.

TROIES. [*Concilium Tricassinum.*] Held Oct. 25, 867. About twenty bishops, from the kingdoms of Charles and Lothaire, were present, who wrote a long letter to pope Nicholas I., in which they give the history of the affair of Ebbo, and of the priests whom he had ordained. They, moreover, besought the pope not to interfere with the rule laid down by his predecessor, and not to permit, in future, the deposition of any bishop without the intervention of the holy see. This was in accordance with the principles of the false decretals of the pope. See C. Soissons, 866. Tom. viii. Conc. p. 868. Troies, 867.

TROIES. Held in 878, by pope John VIII., who presided over thirty bishops. The former had come into France, to escape from the violence of Lambert, duke of Spoletto. In the first session, the pope exhorted the bishops to compassionate the injuries which the Roman Church had suffered from Lambert and his accomplices, and to excommunicate them. The prelates, however, declined to act until the arrival of their brethren. In the second session, John read an account of the ravages committed by Lambert; after which, the council declared him to be worthy of death and anathema. Troies, 878.

The archbishop of Arles presented a petition against bishops and priests leaving one church for another; and also against persons deserting their wives, in order to marry other women. In the third session, the bishops declared their consent to the pope's propositions. Hincmar of Laon, whose eyes had been put out, presented a complaint against his uncle, and demanded to be judged according to the canons. Hincmar of Rheims required

that the cause might be delayed, to give him time to reply to the complaint. Further, the sentence of condemnation passed against Formosus, formerly bishop of Porto, and Gregory a nobleman was read, anathematizing them without hope of absolution; as also were the canons forbidding the translation of bishops; viz. those of Sardica, Africa, and of Pope Leo. Seven canons were published.

1. Orders that temporal lords shall show due respect to bishops, and that they shall not sit down in their presence without their permission.

7. Forbids to receive anonymous accusations against any person.

Troies,1104. TROIES. Held in 1104, by the legate Richard, bishop of Albano, whom Pascal II. had sent into France to absolve king Philip. The council was very numerous, and amongst those present we find Ivo of Chartres. Hubert, bishop of Senlis, accused of simony, cleared himself by oath. The election of the abbot Godefroi, by the people of Amiens, to the bishopric of that town, was approved; and in spite of the abbot's resistance, he was compelled to consent to it.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 738.

Troies,1107. TROIES. Held in 1107, by pope Pascal II., who presided. The main object of this council was to excite the zeal of men for the Crusade; besides which, sentence of excommunication was denounced against those who should violate the Trève de Dieu. The freedom of elections of bishops was asserted and established, and the condemnation of investitures repeated. Several German bishops were on various accounts suspended.

Mansi adds five canons to those usually attributed to this council.

1. Orders that any one receiving investiture at the hands of a layman shall be deposed, as well as the person ordaining or consecrating him.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 754.

Troies,1128 TROIES. Held January 13, 1128, by the legate Matthew, bishop of Albano, assisted by the archbishops of Rheims and Sens, thirteen bishops, and by S. Bernard, S. Stephen, and other abbots. A rule was drawn up for the order of the Templars, instituted in 1118, prepared by authority of the pope and of the patriarch of Jerusalem. In this council the white dress was given to the Templars.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 922.

Trosle, 909. TROSLE (near Soissons). [*Concilium Trosleianum.*]

Held June 26, 909, Herivé, archbishop of Rheims, presiding. The decrees of this council are signed by twelve prelates, and are contained in fifteen chapters; they are in the form rather of long exhortations than of canons, showing the pitiable condition of the Church.

1. Orders due respect to the Church, to clerks, and to monks.

3. Relates to the reform of abuses in monastic institutions.

4. Anathematizes those who pillage the Church.

5. Anathematizes those who injure and persecute the clergy.

6. Is directed against those who refuse tithe.

7. Against rapine and robbery, and orders restitution.

8. Is directed against the violent abduction of women, and incest.

9. Forbids priests to have women in their houses.

10. Exhorts all Christians to charity, and to avoid luxury and excess.

11. Forbids perjury and oath-breaking.

12. Is directed against passionate and litigious persons.

13. Against liars and homicides.

14. Denounces those who plunder the property of bishops after their death.

15. Contains an exhortation to all the faithful to abstain from sin, and to do their duty.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 520.

TURIN. [*Concilium Turinense.*] Held in 398, or, according to others, in 401 [5], to settle certain differences which had arisen amongst the Gallican prelates. The bishops of the province of Aix, Proculus of Marseilles, Simplicius of Vienne, and the bishop of Arles, were present. As Turin was at that time under the metropolitan of Milan, it is conjectured that Simplicianus of Milan convoked it. Turin, 398, or 401.

The first question settled in the council was that of Proculus of Marseilles, who (although that see was not in the province) desired to be recognized as metropolitan of the province of Narbonne. The council, for the sake of peace, granted to Proculus personally, but not to his see, the right of primacy which he claimed, declaring,

[5] There seems to be little doubt that 401 is the right date, since Briscius, who was bishop of Tours at the time it was holden, did not succeed S. Martin in that see until the year 400.—*Labbe.*

however, that after his death, the metropolitan should be a bishop of the province itself.

2. The council took into consideration the differences between the archbishops of Arles and Vienne, who both pretended to the primacy of Viennese Gaul. The decision was, that he of the two who could prove his city to be the metropolis of the province as to civil matters [6], should be considered as the lawful metropolitan, and in the mean time they were exhorted to live in peace.

3. The excuses of the bishops Octavius, Ursion, Remigius, and Triferius, were considered. These prelates were accused of having conferred orders irregularly and uncanonically. The council decided that, in this case, indulgence should be granted to the four bishops; but that in future, any bishops so violating the ancient decrees of the Church should be deprived of the right of ordaining, and of all voice in synodical assemblies; and that those who should be so ordained should be deposed. This canon was confirmed in the council of Riez, A.D. 439.

Several other regulations relating to the affairs of the Church were also made, and eight canons in all published.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1155.

Tyana, 367. TYANA. [*Concilium Tyanense.*] Held in 367. There were present in this council Eusebius of Cesarea, in Cappadocia, Athanasius of Ancyra, Pelagius of Laodicea, S. Gregory Nazianzen the elder, and many others who had declared their belief in the consubstantiality of the Son at Antioch, in 363. The letters of pope Liberius and the bishops of Italy, Sicily, Africa, and Gaul, were read, which had been written to wipe out the disgrace attaching to them on account of the council of Ariminum. Eustathius of Sebaste, formerly deposed, was re-established; and a synodical letter written to all the bishops of the East, exhorting them to testify in writing their rejection of the acts of Ariminum, and their adherence to the faith of Nicea.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 836.

Tyre, 335, pseudo-council. TYRE. The Arians, through Eusebius of Nicomedia, obtained the convocation of this council from the emperor Constantine, under pretext of thereby healing

[6] This decision affords a fair illustration of the mode in which the great sees of Rome, Constantinople, &c., obtained their extensive ecclesiastical power.

the divisions which existed amongst the bishops; but their real intention was to oppress S. Athanasius. Tyre, 335.

The bishops who were summoned to attend were selected by the Eusebian party, and came from Egypt, Lybia, Asia, and most of the eastern provinces; the most noted were Marius of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nicea, Ursaces of Singedunum, and Valens of Mursia, in all about sixty Arian bishops attended. There were also a few bishops present who were not of the Eusebian faction, as S. Maximus of Jerusalem, Marcellus of Ancyra, Alexander of Thessalonica, &c.

Constantine sent the count Dionysius to keep order, who, as the event showed, was completely devoted to the Eusebian cause, and by his violence destroyed all liberty of debate.

S. Athanasius, compelled by the order of the emperor, came to the council, attended by forty-nine Egyptian bishops, amongst whom were Potamon and S. Paphnutius.

No accusation was brought against S. Athanasius on account of his faith, but he was arraigned for having killed a Meletian bishop named Arsenius, and for having forcibly broken into a church whilst Ischyrus, a pretended priest, was celebrating; and for having overturned the altar and broken the sacred chalice. He was made to stand as a criminal, whilst Eusebius and the others sat as his judges, against which treatment S. Potamon of Heraclea made a vehement protest, heaping reproaches upon Eusebius.

From the very first the Egyptian bishops protested against the proceedings, but their objections were not heeded.

Sozomen says that S. Athanasius appeared frequently before the council, and defended himself admirably, listening quietly to all the calumnious accusations brought against him, and replying with patience and wonderful sagacity. However, his enemies, not contented with the charges which they had already brought against him, dared to impeach his purity, and introduced into the council a debauched woman, whom they had bribed to assert that she had been ravished by him. The utter falsehood of the charge was, however, triumphantly proved; for S. Athanasius having deputed one of his priests, named Thimoteus, to reply for him, the woman, who was ignorant even of the person of the holy bishop, mistaking Thimoteus for him, declared that he

was the man who had offered violence to her at such a time and place.

Neither were his accusers more successful in their endeavour to fix upon him the murder of Arsenius, who, in the midst of their false statements, appeared before the council alive. Foiled in both these infamous attempts, the Arians were filled with fury, and endeavoured to offer violence to him, in which, however, they were prevented by the officers of Constantine. Nothing now remained but the charge of having broken the chalice, and there being no proof ready, and the clergy of the country where the offence was said to have taken place having solemnly sworn to the falsehood of the charge, a deputation was sent to make inquiry on the spot (in the Mareotis), composed of the most decided of his enemies. In the meantime Athanasius, seeing that his condemnation, by fair means or foul, was resolved, withdrew from Tyre. The deputies upon their return declared that they had found the charge correct; and upon this statement sentence of deposition was pronounced, on the plea of his having been convicted of a part of the accusation brought against him.

More than fifty bishops protested against the acts of this assembly.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 435.

U.

Udvarde, 1309.

UDVARDE. Held in 1309, under Charles I. king of Hungary, and Thomas, archbishop of Strigonia. It was decreed,

1. That the angelical salutation should be rung out at noon, or at the close of the day.

2. That the inhabitants of Buda should pay some impost which they had endeavoured to evade.

And fourthly, the constitutions of cardinal Gentil[1], were read, and an order made that a copy should be sent to every prelate, to use in his own diocese; the other regulations have perished.—*Mansi, Supp.*—Tom. iii. coll. 335.

Uwienon, 1375.

UWIENON. [*Concilium Unienoviense.*] Held in 1375, under Jaroslov, archbishop of Gnesne. Several statutes were drawn up for the reformation of ecclesi-

[1] Made at the synod of Posen in the same year. Nine chapters relating to ecclesiastical discipline were published.—Conc. Tom. xi. App. 2453.

astical discipline, and a subsidy granted by the clergy towards the expenses of the war against the Turks.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 2043.

URGEL. Held in 799, by Leidrade, archbishop of Lyons, whom Charlemagne had sent, together with Nefridius of Narbonne, the abbot Benedict, and several other bishops and abbots, to Felix, bishop of Urgel. They succeeded in persuading him to present himself to the king, promising him full liberty to produce in his presence those passages from the fathers which he believed to favour his notions. Urgel, 799.

V.

VAISON. [*Concilium Vasense.*] Held Nov. 13, 442, under the bishop Auspicius. Nectarius, bishop of Vienne, was present, and publicly maintained that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is but one Nature, one Power, one Divinity and Virtue. Ten canons were published. Vaison, 442.

1. Declares that it shall not be necessary to examine the Gallican bishops before receiving them to communion, but that it shall be enough to be assured that they are not excommunicated.

2. Declares that the offerings of penitents dying suddenly without receiving the communion, may nevertheless be received; and that mention is to be made of their names at the altars, and permits them burial.

3. Orders priests and deacons to receive the holy chrism at Easter from their own bishops.

6. Forbids all intimacy with the enemies of religion.

9 and 10. Are for the protection of the reputation of those who, out of charity, take charge of deserted children.—Tom. iii. Conc. p. 1456.

VAISON. Held Nov. 5, 529. Twelve bishops attended, amongst whom were S. Cesarius of Arles, who presided. Five canons were published. Vaison, 529.

1. Enjoins that parish priests shall receive into their houses young readers (being single), according to the excellent custom in Italy; that they shall provide for them, and teach them to chant the Psalms, and make them read and study the holy Scriptures.

2. Declares that a priest may preach in his own parish, but that when he is ill, the deacons shall read the Homilies of the fathers.

3. Orders the frequent repetition of the "Kyrie Eleison" at matins, mass, and vespers; and that the Sanctus be sung three times at mass even in Lent, and in masses for the dead.

4. Orders that mention be made of the pope at every mass.

5. Orders that the verse, "As it was in the beginning," &c., shall be chanted after the "*Gloria Patri.*" —Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1679.

Valence, in Dauphiné, 374.

VALENCE (in DAUPHINE). [*Concilium Valentinum.*] Held July 12, 374. Thirty bishops attended, of whom the names of twenty-two have reached us: it is supposed to have been a general Gallican council, or at least collected from the chief part of Narbonnesian Gaul. The object of this council was to remedy the disorders which had crept into the discipline of the Church. Four canons were published.

1. Forbids the ordination in future of men who have had two wives, or who have married widows, but it does not insist upon the deposition of those who had been already ordained.

2. Forbids to grant penance too easily to young women who, after consecrating themselves to God, voluntarily embraced the married state.

3. Forbids absolution until death to those who, after baptism, fall back into idolatry, or who have received a second baptism.

4. Orders that all bishops, priests, and deacons, falsely accusing themselves of any crimes in order to be deposed, and so escape the responsibility and weight of their orders, shall be, in fact, so deposed, and considered as guilty of the crimes wherewith they charge themselves.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 904.

Valence, 530.

VALENCE. Held about 530, in defence of the doctrines of grace and free will, against the Semi-Pelagians. See C. ORANGE, A. D. 529.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1678.

Valence, 855.

VALENCE. Held January 8, 855, by order of the emperor Lothaire; fourteen bishops, with the metropolitans, attended from the three provinces of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles. The object of the council was to investigate the conduct of the bishop of Valence, who was accused of various crimes. Twenty-three canons were published.

The first six relate to the subjects of grace, free will,

and predestination, and reject the four canons of Quiercy upon the matter.

7. Relates to the elections of bishops with the unanimous consent of the clergy and people of the see.

12. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, the singular combats to which accused persons had recourse in those times in order to prove their innocence. Directs that he who shall kill or wound his adversary, shall be treated as a murderer, and excommunicated; and that the man killed shall be regarded as a suicide, and forbidden Christian burial.

14. Enjoins bishops not to give their clergy or people cause to complain against them on account of their vexations.

15. Recommends them to lead an exemplary life.

16. Orders them to preach and instruct their people both in town and country.

17. Bids them be careful to make their visitations without burdening any one.

18. Orders the re-establishment of schools for teaching religion, literature, and ecclesiastical chanting.

20. Orders care in the preservation of the Church ornaments, &c., and forbids their being put to any but their proper use.

22. Forbids bishops to exact their visitation dues when they do not make their visitations.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 133.

Valence, 1100.

VALENCE. Held in 1100, to examine the charge brought by the canons of Autun against Norigaudus or Norgaud, bishop of Autun, whom they accused of having got possession of the see by simony, and of having squandered the property belonging to it. The pope's legates, John and Benedict, cited the bishop to appear at this council, in spite of the protest of the canons, who declared that the legates had no authority to take them beyond the province, and in spite of the opposition of the archbishop of Lyons, who complained of the legates having taking the judgment of the case out of his hands. The question accordingly came before the council, and was discussed, but the further consideration of it was reserved for the council of Poictiers. In the mean time the bishop was suspended from the exercise of all his functions.

Hugo, abbot of Flavigni, accused likewise of simony, was declared to be innocent.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 717.

Valence, 1248. VALENCE. Held on the Saturday after the feast of S. Andrew. The legates, Peter, cardinal bishop of Albano, and Hugo, cardinal priest of S. Sabine, convoked this council, consisting of four archbishops and fifteen bishops from the provinces of Narbonne, Vienne in Dauphine, Arles, and Aix. Twenty-three canons were published.

3. Forbids clerks in holy orders, cathedral canons, and other beneficed persons, to exercise any secular office.

6, 7, and 8. Enjoin the punishment and public denouncement of perjured persons.

9, 10, and 11. Relate to the inquisition.

12. Gives to bishops the correction of sorcerers and persons guilty of sacrilege, and in the event of their refusing to amend, enjoins perpetual imprisonment, or whatever punishment the bishops may deem right.

13. Enacts penalties against those who lay aside the cross, which they have assumed upon their dress as a token of having renounced their heresy, or who escape from prison, or despise the sentence of excommunication.

The five next refer to excommunications.

22 and 23. Fulminate excommunications against the emperor Frederick and all his adherents.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 696.

Valencia, 524. VALENCIA (in Spain). [*Concilium Valentinum.*] Held in 524, under king Theodoric. Six bishops attended, and six canons were published.

1. Orders that previous to the presentation of the oblations, and the dismissal of the catechumens, the gospel shall be read after the epistle, in order that the catechumens, penitents, and even the heathen, may hear the words of Christ and the preaching of the bishop.

4. Exhorts bishops to visit their sick brethren in the episcopate, in order to assist them in settling their affairs, and to attend to their funerals. In case of a bishop dying suddenly with no one of his brother bishops near him, it is ordered that the body shall be kept until a bishop can come to celebrate his obsequies.

5. Excommunicates vagabond clerks who desert their calling.

6. Forbids to ordain a clerk belonging to another diocese, and any person whatever who will not promise to remain in the diocese.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1617.

VALLADOLID. [*Concilium apud Vallemoleti* or *Vallum Oletum.*] Held in 1322, by cardinal William, bishop of Savina, and legate of pope John XXII.[7] A preface and twenty-seven canons were published by his direction, and with the approbation of the council. Valladolid, 1322.

1. Orders that provincial councils be held every two years, and diocesan synods annually.

2. Orders all curates to read four times a year, in the vulgar tongue, to their parishioners the articles of belief, the decalogue, the number of the sacraments, and the different virtues and vices.

4. Orders that Sundays and festivals be kept holy.

10. Orders that bishops shall assign limits to parishes.

11. Excommunicates monks who fraudulently evade payment of tithes.

13. Exhorts curates to exercise hospitality.

14. Forbids to present to churches before a vacancy, or to present infants.

16. Declares them to be excommunicated, *ipso facto*, who eat or sell meat on any fast day.

17. Forbids secular meetings within churches, fairs, &c., in churchyards, and to fortify churches as places of defence.

20. Grants to clerks three years for study, during which time they may receive the fruits of their benefices without residence.

23 and 24. Excommunicates those who seize men and sell them to the Saracens; also all wizards, enchanters, and those who consult them.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1682.

VANNES. [*Concilium Veneticum.*] Held in 465, by S. Perpetuus, the first archbishop of Tours, who presided over five other bishops. Paternus was in this council consecrated to the see of Vannes, and sixteen canons were published; many of which are the same with those of Tours, A. D. 461. The following are peculiar to this council. Vannes, 465.

2. Excommunicates those who marry again after having divorced their first wives, unless it was on account of adultery.

7. Forbids monks to retire into solitary cells, except they be men of tried virtue, and upon condition that they keep within the precincts of the abbey, and under the abbot's jurisdiction.

8. Forbids abbots to hold many monasteries or cells.

[7] Or John XX., with Labbe and others.

11. Prohibits priests, deacons, and subdeacons, who are forbidden to marry, from attending marriage festivals, feasts, and assemblies at which love songs, &c., are sung, and immodest conversations held.

12. Forbids all clerks to attend Jewish festivals.

13. Excommunicates for thirty days ecclesiastics guilty of the sin of drunkenness, and enjoins even corporal punishment.

14. Excommunicates for seven days clerks who, living in the city, absent themselves from matins.

15. Orders that the same manner of celebrating Divine service shall be observed throughout the province of Lyons.

16. Excommunicates those of the clergy who meddle in divinations, and superstitiously pretend to foretel the future by chance readings of Holy Scripture.

These regulations are addressed to Victorius, bishop of Maur, and Thalassius of Angers, who were unable to attend the council.—Tom. iv. Conc. p. 1054.

Venice, 1177.

VENICE. [*Concilium Venetum.*] Held in 1177, by pope Alexander III., assisted by his cardinals, and several bishops from Italy, Germany, Lombardy, and Tuscany. The emperor Frederic, who had previously renounced the schism, and made peace with Alexander, was present. The pope pronounced sentence of excommunication against all troublers of the peace.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1481.

Verberic, in the diocese of Soissons, 753.

VERBERIC (in the diocese of Soissons). [*Concilium Vermeriense.*] Held in 753, by order of king Pepin. This council was, properly speaking, a national assembly. Twenty-one canons were published, chiefly relating to the subject of marriages.

1. Declares, that the marriages of relatives to the third degree of consanguinity, are utterly null, so that the parties so married, are at liberty, after penance, to marry others. That those who are related only in the fourth degree shall not be separated if married, but be put to penance.

3. Forbids a priest to marry, under pain of losing his rank. Forbids any one to marry the wife of a man who has been made priest.

5. Permits a man whose wife has conspired to murder him, to put her away, and to marry another.

6. Permits those persons who have married slaves, under the idea of their being free, to marry again.

9. Declares, that in cases in which men are absolutely obliged to leave their place of abode, to go to live elsewhere, if their wives refuse to go with them for no other reason than their affection for their country, or relations, or property, it shall be lawful for the husband to marry another, but not for the wife who remains behind.

14. Forbids bishops, when travelling out of their own diocese, to ordain priests, and orders that persons so ordained, if they be really worthy of the priesthood, shall be ordained again.

15. Allows a degraded priest to baptize a sick person in case of necessity.

16. Forbids clerks to wear arms.

19. Forbids married slaves who are sold separately to different masters, to marry others, although they have no hope of ever being united again.

21. Enacts, that a husband who has permitted his wife to take the veil shall not marry another.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1656.

VERBERIC. Held in 869. Twenty bishops being present, with Charles the Bald; Hincmar of Laon was accused, and appealed to the pope; at the same time, he demanded leave to go to Rome, which, at the instigation of his uncle, was refused, but the proceedings against him were suspended. Tom. viii. Conc. p. 1527. Verberic, 869.

VERCEIL. [*Concilium Vercellense.*] Held in September 1050, by pope Leo IX. Bishops attended from various nations. Berenger was cited to appear, but refused to attend; his errors were condemned, and the book of John Scotus upon the Eucharist was burned.—*Lanfranc de Corp. Dom.* l. 4.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1055. Verceil, 1050.

VERDUN. [*Concilium Virdunense.*] Held in November 947, by seven bishops, who confirmed Artaldus in the possession of the see of Rheims, which Hugo disputed with him. See council of Monson, 948.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 622. Verdun, 947.

VERNEUIL. [*Concilium Vernense.*] Held in 844, in December. Ebrouin, arch-chaplain of Charles the Bald, and bishop of Poictiers, presided, with Venilon, archbishop of Sens. Twelve canons were published, addressed to Charles the Bald. Verneuil, 844.

1. Contains an exhortation to the king.

2, 3. Contain an entreaty that he would send forth a

commissioner to set in order what was irregular, and to repress crime, &c.

7. Renews the canon of Gangra, against certain female religious, who under pretext of higher perfection, had taken to wearing male attire.

8. Directs that when bishops are excused from going to the wars, either by infirmity, or by the kindness of the prince, they shall appoint fit men to lead their people.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1805.

Vernum, 754.

VERNUM. A council was held in 754, at a place in France, named in Latin, Vernum. Some doubt exists as to its locality; Fleury and Le Cointe say, that it is Vernon-sur-Seine; Pagi, following Mabillon, says Verneuil-sur-Oise; Lebeuf, and Don Bouquet, maintain that it is a place called Ver, or Vern, a royal seat, situated between Paris and Compeigne.

The council was assembled by order of King Pepin, and the bishops of all the Gallican provinces attended. The object was to re-establish discipline, and they agreed to remedy at once the most grievous abuses, and to leave lesser matters till a more favourable opportunity. Twenty-five canons were published.

1. Enacts, that no bishop shall hold more than one see.

3. Gives to the bishop authority to correct both the regulars and seculars within his diocese.

4. Orders that two synods be holden annually in France.

5. Leaves to the bishop the reform of the religious houses in his diocese; if he cannot effect it, he is directed to apply to the metropolitan, and lastly, to the synod.

7. Forbids to erect baptisteries without the bishop's permission.

8. Orders priests to attend the synod of bishops, and forbids them to baptize, or to celebrate the holy office without their permission.

13. Forbids itinerant bishops (who have no diocese), to perform any function.

14. Forbids all work on Sundays, save such as is absolutely necessary. (3 Council Orange, c. 28).

17. Forbids to leave a bishoprick vacant for more than three months.

18. Forbids clerks to carry their causes before lay tribunals.

24. Forbids simony.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 1664.

VERONA. [*Concilium Veronese.*] Held on the 1st of August, 1184, for the purpose of reconciling those who had been ordained by the antipopes. Pope Lucius III. published a constitution against the heretics, in the presence of the emperor Frederic; the object was to repress the fury of the Cathari, Paterini, and the other heretics of that period. In this council, we perceive the commencement of the system of inquisition, since the bishops are ordered, by means of commissaries, to inform themselves of persons suspected of heresy, whether by common report or private information. A distinction is drawn between the suspected and convicted, the penitent and relapsed, and different degrees of punishment are accordingly awarded. After all the spiritual penalties of the Church have been employed in vain, it is ordered that the offenders be given up to the secular arm, in order that temporal punishments may be inflicted.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1741 and 1737. Verona, 1184.

VEZELAI. [*Concilium Vezeliacum.*] Held in 1146, after the capture of Edessa by the Saracens. Louis VII., the archbishop, bishops, abbots, and many of the nobility of France attended. S. Bernard, who was present, urged him, with great eloquence, to succour the Christians against the Turks. The king was amongst the first to assume the cross, together with his wife Eleanor. After them, Alphonso, count of St. Gilles, Thierry, count of Flanders, count Guido, and many others of the nobility, took the vow.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1100. Vezelai, 1146.

VIENNE. [*Concilium Vindobonense.*] Held May 10, 1267, by Guy, cardinal legate. A constitution in nineteen articles was published, very similar to that drawn up in the council of Cologne, in the year preceding. Vienne, 1267.

By canon 3, clerks having wives or concubines, were ordered to separate from them within a month, under pain of being deprived.

6. All pluralities were forbidden.

14. Forbids abbots to consecrate chalices, patens, or any ecclesiastical vessel or vestment.

The last five relate to the Jews.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 858.

VIENNE (in Dauphine). [*Concilium apud Viennam Allobrogum.*] Held in 892, by order of pope Vienne, in Dauphiné, 892.

Formosus, whose two legates, Pascal and John, presided. Several bishops were present, and four canons were published.

1, 2. Excommunicates those who seize the property of the Church, or maltreat clerks.

4. Forbids laymen to present to churches, without the consent of the bishop of the diocese; also forbids them to take any present from those whom they present. —Tom. ix. Conc. p. 433.

Vienne, 1199.

VIENNE. [*Concilium Viennense.*] Held in December 1199, by Peter of Capua, legate, who, in the presence of several bishops, published an interdict upon all places within the dominions of the king Philip Augustus, on account of his unlawful marriage, at the same time ordering all bishops to observe it, under pain of suspension.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 11.

Vienne, 1311 & 1312, falselystyled the 15th œcumenical.

VIENNE. Held October 1, 1311, under Clement V., who presided. The object of the council was the extinction of the order of the Templars, and the re-establishment of discipline. The king, Philip-le-Bel, was present, accompanied by his brother Charles de Valois, and his three sons, Louis, king of Navarre, Philip, and Charles.

For a long time past, loud complaints had been made against the Templars, on account of their alleged bad faith and arrogance, and their abuse of their privileges. In the bull of convocation, the pope declared that he had heard with sorrow, that this order had fallen into utter apostasy, and into the most unheard-of crimes; that Philip of France had given him information upon the subject. Urged thereto by a pious zeal, and by no interested motive, since it was not his intention to appropriate to himself the possessions of the Templars, the pope further declares, that he had, in the presence of several of the cardinals, examined as many as seventy-two of the Templars, who had confessed, that at the reception of brethren into the order, they were made to renounce Jesus Christ, to spit upon the cross, and to do other horrible acts which decency forbade even to mention.

The Templars in France had been arrested throughout the kingdom, by order of the king, and many of them confessed the same horrible impieties and sacrilegious conduct. But as their confessions were forced from them by tortures, very little credit seems to be due to them;

added to this, there is a marvellous variation in the different accounts given by historians of this affair. However this may be, the pope issued another bull, ordering all bishops to gather what information they could against the Templars, in their respective dioceses, and named commissioners to take proceedings against the whole order. The grand master, James de Molis, or de Molay, was cited to appear before the commissioners at Paris. These commissioners were, the archbishop of Narbonne, the bishops of Bayeux, Mende, and Limoges, and three archdeacons. Being questioned as to the confession which he had made before the cardinals, the grand master testified horror at the crimes of which he was accused, and declared, that had he been at liberty he should have spoken very differently. Vienne, 1311 & 1312.

Fifty-nine of these wretched men were burnt at Paris, in the field near the abbey of St. Anthony, not one of whom confessed the crimes imputed to them, but, to the last, maintained their innocence, which had a great effect upon the people at large. At Senlis, nine were burnt, who also denied their guilt, and declared that their confession had been forced from them by the horrible tortures which they had endured.

More than three hundred bishops attended this council, without reckoning abbots and priors. In the first session, the pope laid open the three causes which had induced him to convoke the assembly. Session I. Oct. 16.

The next session was not held until the year following. In the interval, various conferences were held upon the subject of the Templars, and all the bishops agreed, that before condemning them they ought to be heard in their own defence.

However, on the 22d of March, 1312, the pope, in the presence of several bishops and cardinals, abolished the order of Templars, reserving for his own disposal, and that of the Church, their property and persons.

In the second session, the king, his three sons, and his brother, were present, and the pope published his decree suppressing the order, which had existed for one hundred and eighty-four years, their property was given to the knights Hospitallers of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, now called the knights of Malta, excepting their possessions in the kingdoms of Castile, Arragon, Portugal, and Majorca, which were destined for the defence of the country against the Moslems. As to the Session II. April 3, 1312.

Vienne, 1311 & 1312.

persons of the Templars, it was ordered, that those who were deemed innocent should be supported from the funds of the order. That those who had confessed their crimes should be treated leniently, and that the unpenitent should be rigorously punished. As for those who had endured the torture without confessing, it was settled that their case should be reserved, in order to be judged by the canons.

The grand master, with the commanders of Normandy and Aquitaine, who had been at first condemned by the three cardinal legates to perpetual imprisonment, because they had confessed the crimes charged against them, having subsequently retracted their confession, and declared their innocence, were given up into the hands of the provost; upon which Philip-le-Bel, without consulting a single ecclesiastic, by the advice of some of those about him, caused them to be burnt, and they died maintaining their innocence to the last.

Clement V. had given instructions to the bishops to bring with them to the council a brief summary of those matters which, in their judgment, most needed reform. Two of these memoirs remain; one by William Durandus, bishop of Mende[8], and the other by a bishop unknown. The latter proposes, amongst other things, the reform of such abuses as the following: the immense number of sentences of excommunication inflicted for trifling offences; the constant voyages of ecclesiastics to Rome; the large number of benefices, in every country, given by the court of Rome to foreigners, to the injury of the native clergy; plurality of benefices; the disorderly lives of the beneficed clergy; the extravagance exhibited at their tables, and the luxury of their dress.

The Bishop of Mende desired to return to antiquity, and to the observation of the ancient canons. That the granting of dispensations should be kept within proper bounds; that provincial councils should be held, &c. That the tenth of the revenue of all benefices should be granted to poor scholars studying in the university. He also insisted upon a thorough reform in the court of Rome, &c. &c.

Much was said in this council upon the subject of

[8] This Durandus was the nephew of the celebrated bishop of the same name and see (Speculator); he composed a treatise on the manner of celebrating general councils.

exemptions; the bishops required their total abolition, and that all ecclesiastics, regular and secular, should be subject to them. This demand gave rise to a long dispute. Vienne, 1311 & 1312.

The celebrated difference between Philip-le-Bel and Pope Bonifacius VIII., was also terminated. The council declared Bonifacius, whom Philip had all along treated as a heretic, to have been a sound catholic, and to have done nothing meriting the charge of heresy. In order, however, to satisfy the king, the pope published a decree to this effect, that neither he, nor his successor, should be at any time accused concerning his conduct towards Bonifacius.

Further, certain errors attributed to John d'Olive, a Minorite, were condemned. It was declared, that the Son of God took to himself both parts of our human nature, i. e. both soul and body, which together form the real body; and that whosoever shall maintain that the reasonable soul is not an essential part of the human body, shall be regarded as a heretic.

In the third and last session, a constitution drawn up by the pope was published, for promoting union amongst the Minorites, who had been torn by divisions for a long time past. Various regulations were also made, affecting the begging friars, and a rule of life laid down for the black monks, and regular canons. The Beguins (Beguardi Beguinæ) were condemned [9], and a regulation drawn up upon the subject of hospitals. Lastly, the pope, in the name of the council, made two constitutions upon the privileges of monks and others who were exempt. 1. To defend them against the encroachments of the bishops, and the 2nd to check the abuse of their privileges. In the latter, it is forbidden to a monk, under pain of excommunication, *ipso facto*, Session III. May 6.

[9] "Beguardi and Beguinæ." These people are not to be confounded with the order of Beguinæ or Beguins, founded by Lambert Beghum, a priest of Liege, about 1170, but were a sect of heretics, a branch of the Fraticelli. They took their rise in Germany, and, amongst other things, taught that men can attain to an impeccable state in this life; and that in that state they need no longer fast, pray, or obey any of the precepts of the Church; but, on the contrary, that their spiritual part having attained to such perfection, they are at liberty to yield to every bodily impulse. They seem to have broken out again in Spain in 1623, under the name of "Illuminati."

to administer extreme unction, the eucharist, and the viaticum, or to give the nuptial benediction, without permission from the curate.

The pope also confirmed the establishment of the festival of the Holy Sacrament, instituted by Urban IV. It was further enacted, that in order to promote the study of the oriental languages, and so to facilitate the conversion of the heathen, professors of Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee, two for each language, should be established at Rome, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca; those at Rome to be maintained and paid by the pope; those at Paris, by the king of France; and the others by the prelates and chapters of their respective nations.

The bull of Bonifacius VIII., "*Clericis laicos*," upon the immunities of clerks, was revoked, and a tenth ordered to be levied upon all ecclesiastical revenues, in aid of the crusade to the Holy Land.—*Raynal*, A.D. 1311, liv.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1537.

W.

Waterford, 1158.

WATERFORD. [*Synodus Guaterfordia.*] Held about 1158; in which it was ordered, that all the English slaves throughout Ireland should be liberated, to avert the Divine wrath. It seems that many of the English had been in the habit of selling their own children to the Irish for slaves, and that not under the pressure of extreme want.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 1183.

Both the date and place of this council is probably incorrect, as the account of it in Labbe exactly coincides with that of the council of Armagh, in 1171, (which see), and in both the council is said to have been convoked "*apud Ardmachiam.*"

Westminster, 1070 (or 1078, *Wilkins*).

WESTMINSTER. [*Concilium Westmonasteriense.*] Held about 1070, by archbishop Lanfranc, in the presence of William I., in which Wulstan, bishop of Worcester, who alone of the Saxon bishops had withstood William, was deprived, upon the plea of want of learning. When he found that he was to be stripped of his episcopal vestments, he boldly exclaimed to William, "These I owe to a better man than thee, to him will I restore

them." Whereupon, he went to the tomb of Edward the Confessor, who had advanced him to his see, and there taking off his vestments he laid them down, and struck his pastoral staff so deep into the stone, that, as the legend states, no human force could draw it out. This miracle, or his deserved reputation for sanctity, produced a revision of the sentence of deprivation, and he retained his bishoprick.—*Johnson, Preface to Lanfranc's Canons at Winchester. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 367. *Wharton, Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. p. 225.

Westminster, 1102.

WESTMINSTER. Held in 1102, "in S. Peter's church, on the west side of London," i. e. at Westminster. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, and Gerard, of York, being present, with eleven other bishops, and some abbots. In this synod, three great abbots were deposed for simony; three not yet consecrated were turned out of their abbeys; and three others deprived for other crimes. Roger (the king's chancellor), was consecrated to the see of Salisbury, and Roger (the king's larderer), to Hereford. Twenty-nine canons were published.

1. Forbids bishops to keep secular Courts of Pleas, and to apparel themselves like laymen.

2. Forbids to let archdeaconries to farm.

3. Enacts that archdeacons must be deacons.

4. Enacts that no archdeacon, priest, deacon, or canon, shall marry, or retain his wife, if married. Enacts the same with regard to subdeacons who have married after profession of chastity.

5. Declares that a priest guilty of fornication, is not a lawful priest, and forbids him to celebrate mass.

6. Orders that no one be ordained sub-deacon, or to any higher order, except he profess chastity.

7. Orders that the sons of priests be not heirs to their fathers' churches.

8. Orders that no clergyman be a judge in a case of blood.

9. Orders that priests go not to drinking bouts, nor drink to pegs [2].

[2] "One contrivance of his" (Dunstan's) "is commonly recorded, as designed to check the prevailing vice of drunkenness. He was the inventor of a way of ornamenting the drinking-cups which were passed round the table with little nails or pegs one above another, of gold or silver, as the material of the cup might be; that every guest, when called to drink his portion, might know how much the law of the feast required of him, and might

Westminster, 1102.

10. Orders that their clothes be all of one colour, and their shoes plain.

11. Orders monks or clerks who have forsaken their order, to return, or be excommunicated.

12. Orders that the tonsure of clerks be visible.

13. Orders that tithe be paid to the Church only.

14. Forbids to buy churches or prebends.

15. Forbids to build new chapels, without the bishop's consent.

16. Forbids to consecrate new churches, until all things necessary for it, and the priest, have been provided.

17. Forbids abbots to create knights; orders them to eat and sleep in the same house with their monks.

18. Forbids monks to enjoin penance except in certain cases.

19. Forbids monks to be godfathers, and nuns godmothers.

20. Forbids monks to hire farms.

21. Forbids monks to accept of the impropriations of churches without the bishop's consent, and further forbids them to spoil and reduce to poverty those who minister in their parishes.

22. Declares promises of marriage made without witnesses to be null, if either party deny them.

23. Orders that those who have hair be clipped, so that their ears and eyes shall be visible.

24. Forbids those who are related within the seventh degree to marry.

25. Forbids to defraud the priest of his dues, by carrying a corpse for burial to another parish.

26. Forbids to attribute reverence or sanctity to a dead body, or fountain, &c. without the bishop's authority.

27. Forbids to sell men like beasts, as had hitherto been done in England.

28. Anathematizes persons guilty of certain horrible sins of uncleanness.

29. Orders the publication of the above excommunication in all churches every Sunday.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. MCII. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 382.

not be obliged to swallow a larger draught against his will. Hence seems to have come the old English proverb, which speaks of a man being a peg too high, or a peg too low, according to the state of his spirits."—*Churton, Early English Church*, p. 252.

WESTMINSTER. Held January 13, 1126. Otto, the pope's nuncio, was present, and read a bull of Honorius, containing the same proposition which the legate had made to the French clergy assembled at Bourges, in November, 1225; viz. That in every cathedral church, the pope should nominate to two prebends, and in every monastery to two places. The bishops separated without coming to any decision. Tom. xi. Conc. p. 303. Westminster, 1126.

WESTMINSTER. Held September 9, 1126, by William Carboil, archbishop of Canterbury; John de Cremona[3], legate from Honorius II., presiding. Thurstan, archbishop of York, and about twenty bishops, forty abbots, and an innumerable assembly of clergy and people were present. Seventeen canons were published. Westminster, 1126.

1. Forbids simony.

2. Forbids to charge anything for chrism, oil, baptism, visiting and anointing the sick, communion, and burial.

3. Forbids to demand cope, carpet, towel, or basin, at the consecration of bishops, or churches, or blessing of abbots.

4. Forbids investiture at the hands of lay persons.

5. Forbids any one to challenge a church or benefice by inheritance; and to appoint a successor. Psalm lxxxiii. 12, 13, is quoted.

6. Deprives beneficed clerks who refused to be ordained (priests or deacons) in order that they might live more at liberty.

7. Orders that none but priests be made deacons or priors, nor any but deacons, archdeacons.

8. Forbids to ordain any one priest without a title.

9. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to eject any one from a church to which he has been instituted, without the bishop's sentence.

10. Forbids bishops to ordain or pass sentence upon any one belonging to the jurisdiction of another bishop.

11. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to receive an excommunicated person to communion.

12. Forbids any one to hold two dignities in the Church.

[3] The conduct of this man was grossly inconsistent with his persecution of the married clergy. The whole subject is well considered by Collier, Church History, vol. i. p. 318.

13. Forbids priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and canons, to dwell in the same house with any woman, except a mother, sister, aunt, or unsuspected woman. Offenders to lose their order.

14. Forbids the practice of usury amongst clerks [4].

15. Excommunicates sorcerers, &c.

16. Forbids marriage within the seventh degree.

17. Declares that no regard is to be paid to husbands who implead their wives as too near akin to them.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 406. *Johnson, Eccl. Canons*, A.D. 1126.

Westminster, 1127.

WESTMINSTER. Held in 1127, by William Corboil, archbishop of Canterbury, the pope's legate [5], ten English bishops attended, and three Welch. It is also said, that the multitude of clergy and laity of all ranks who flocked to the council was immense, but no mention is made of abbots. The archbishop of York sent excuses, and the bishops of Durham and Worcester were also absent; the sees of London and Coventry were at the time vacant.

This synod sat three several days, and ten canons were published.

1. Forbids, "by the authority of Peter, prince of the apostles," and that of the archbishop and bishops assembled, the buying and selling of churches and benefices.

2. Forbids any one to be ordained, or preferred, by means of money.

3. Forbids all demands of money for admitting monks, canons, or nuns.

4. Orders that priests only shall be made deans [6], and deacons, archdeacons.

5. Forbids priests, deacons, sub-deacons, and canons, to live with women not allowed by law. Those that adhered to their concubines or wives to be deprived of

[4] So strong were the prejudices against any thing approaching to usury, that in the constitutions of William of Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester, published in 1240, it is forbidden to clerks even to *buy growing corn*, lest by selling time, which God would have common to all, they fall into sin, while they purchase cheaply, and dispose of at a high price, that which required only time (a thing not to be sold) to make it valuable.

[5] He was the first archbishop who had the title of legate of the apostolical see.—*Johnson.*

[6] Heads of monasteries were at this time frequently called deans.—*Johnson.*

their order, dignity, and benefice; if *parish priests*[7], to be cast out of the choir, and declared infamous.

6. Requires archdeacons and others whom it concerned, to use all their endeavours to root out this plague from the Church.

7. Orders the expulsion from the parish of the concubines of priests and canons, unless they are lawfully married there. If they be afterwards found faulty, directs that they shall be brought under ecclesiastical discipline, or servitude, at the discretion of the bishop.

8. Forbids, under anathema, any one to hold several archdeaconries in several bishopricks, and directs him to keep to that he first took; forbids priests, abbots, and monks to take any thing to farm.

9. Orders the payment of tithe in full. Forbids churches, or tithes, or benefices, to be given or taken without the consent of the bishop.

10. That no abbess or nun use more costly apparel than such as is made of lamb's or cat's skins.

Matthew of Paris declares, that the king (Henry I.), eluded all these provisions (to which he had given his consent), by obtaining from the archbishop a promise that he should be entrusted with their execution, whereas, in reality, he executed them only by taking money from the priests as a ransom for their concubines.—*Johnson, Eccl. Can.* A. D. 1127. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 410.

WESTMINSTER. Held in 1138, by Alberic, bishop of Ostia, legate of pope Innocentius II. during the vacancy of the see of Canterbury, eighteen bishops, and about thirty abbots attended, who proceeded to the election of Theobald to the see of Canterbury. Seventeen canons were published. Westminster, 1138.

1. Forbids to demand any price for chrism, oil, baptism, penance, visitation of the sick, espousals, unction, communion, or burial, under pain of excommunication.

2. Orders that the body of Christ be not reserved above eight days, and that it be ordinarily carried to the sick by a priest or deacon only; in case of extreme necessity by any one, but with the greatest reverence.

[7] Johnson states this to be the first mention of a parish priest, and remarks, that this canon distinguishes him from the beneficed priest. The first Constitution of Islip plainly distinguishes between the parish priest and them who had the cure of souls; it seems, therefore, that they were such priests as officiated under resident incumbents who did not officiate themselves.

Westminster, 1138.

3. Forbids to demand a cope, ecclesiastical vestment, or any thing else, upon the consecration of bishops and benediction of abbots; also forbids to require a carpet, towel, basin, or any thing beyond the canonical procuration upon the dedication of a church.

4. Forbids to demand any extra fees when a bishop not belonging to the diocese consecrates a church.

5. Forbids lay investitures; orders every one, upon investiture by the bishop, to swear on the gospels, that he has not, directly or indirectly, given or promised any thing for it, else the donation to be null.

6. Is identical with canon 5, A. D. 1126.

7. Forbids persons ordained by other than their own bishop without letters from him, to exercise their office; reserves the restoration of them to their order to the pope, unless they take a religious habit.

8. Deprives concubinary clerks, and forbids any to hear their mass.

9. Deprives usurious clergymen.

10. Anathematizes him that kills, imprisons, or lays hands on a clerk, monk, nun, or other ecclesiastical person. Forbids any but the pope to grant him penance at the last, except in extreme danger of death; denies him burial if he die impenitent.

11. Excommunicates all persons violently taking away the goods of the Church.

12. Forbids any one to build a church or oratory upon his estate without the bishop's licence.

13. Forbids the clergy to carry arms, and fight in the wars.

14. Forbids monks after receiving orders, to recede from their former way of living.

15. Forbids nuns, under anathema, to use party-coloured skins or golden rings, and to wreathe their hair.

16. Commands, under anathema, all persons to pay the tithe of all their fruits.

17. Forbids schoolmasters to hire out their schools to be governed by others.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, A. D. 1138. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 413.

Westminster, 1176.

WESTMINSTER. Held in 1176, by cardinal Hugo or Hugezen, who had been sent from Rome to endeavour to settle the dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York; the latter of whom claimed the right of having his cross borne before him in the pro-

vince of Canterbury [8]. Many prelates and clergy attended; but when Roger of York, upon entering the assembly, perceived that the seat on the right hand of the legate had been assigned to the archbishop of Canterbury, and that on the left kept for himself, he thrust himself into the lap of the archbishop of Canterbury; whereupon the servants of the latter and many of the bishops (as Hoveden writes) threw themselves upon the archbishop of York, and forced him down upon the ground, trampled upon him, and rent his cope; upon which the council broke up in confusion.—*Johnson. Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 485.

WESTMINSTER. A national council held in 1200, by Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury, in which fifteen canons were published. Westminster, 1200.

1. Orders the priest to say the canon of the mass [9] distinctly, and to rehearse the hours and all the offices plainly, and without clipping the words. Offenders to be suspended.

2. Forbids to celebrate two masses in one day except in case of necessity. When it is done, it directs that nothing be poured into the chalice after the first celebration, but that the least drop be diligently supped out of the chalice, and the fingers sucked and washed; the washings to be drunk by the priest after the second celebration [1], except a deacon be present to do so at the time. Orders that the Eucharist be kept in a decent pyx, and carried to the sick with cross and candle; care to be taken not to confuse the consecrated and unconsecrated hosts.

3. Orders that baptism and confirmation shall be conferred upon those concerning whom there exists a doubt whether or not they have received them. Forbids fathers, mothers-in-law, and parents to hold the child at the font. Forbids deacons to baptize and give penance, except in case of the priest's absence, or other necessity. Permits even a father or mother to baptize their child in case of necessity, and orders that all that

[8] This deplorable dispute continued for many years; it is mentioned as breaking out afresh in 1325. See Wharton, Anglia Sacra, vol. i. p. 365.

[9] The "Canon of the mass," or secret part, is that from the end of the Trisagium to the end of the Consecration.

[1] This might not be done at the time, because it was not lawful for him to break his fast before celebrating.

Westminster, 1200.

follows after the immersion, shall be completed subsequently by the priest.

4. Relates to the administration of penance.

5. Renews the decrees of the council of Lateran, A. D. 1179, which restrict the expences and retinue of prelates and other ordinaries when in visitation, and declares the design of visitations to be to see to what concerns the cure of souls, and that every church have a silver chalice, decent vestments, and necessary books, utensils, &c.

6. Orders that bishops ordaining any one without a title, shall maintain him till he can make a clerical provision for him.

7. Renews the canon of Lateran, A. D. 1179, which forbids prelates to excommunicate their subjects without canonical warning. Orders the yearly pronunciation of a general excommunication against persons guilty of various specified crimes.

8. Renews canon 7, Lateran, A. D. 1179.

9. Orders the payment of tithe without abatement for wages, &c.; grants to priests the power of excommunicating, before harvest, all withholders of tithe. Orders the tithe of land newly cultivated to be paid to the parish church. Orders detainers of tithe to be anathematized.

10. Forbids to institute any persons to churches not worth more than three marks per annum who will not serve in person. Renews the 11th canon of Lateran, A. D. 1179. Forbids clerks to go to taverns and drinking booths, and so put themselves in the way of being insulted by laymen. Orders all the clergy to use the canonical tonsure and clerical habit, and archdeacons and dignified clergymen copes with sleeves.

11. Forbids marriage under various circumstances; orders that the banns be thrice published, that marriage be celebrated openly in the face of the Church.

12. Orders those who being suspected of crimes deny them, to undergo a purgation.

13. Renews the 23rd canon of Lateran, 1179, concerning churches and priests for lepers.

14. Renews canon 9 of Lateran, which forbids the Templars and other fraternities to accept of tithes, churches, &c., without the bishop's consent.

15. Renews canon 10 of Lateran, 1179, and contains various regulations relating to the dress, &c., of the

religious.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 505. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons, in ann.*

Westminster, 1229.

WESTMINSTER. Held about 1229, by Richard Wethershed, archbishop of Canterbury. Twelve constitutions were published, eleven of which are the same with those published in the council of London, A. D. 1175. The last refers to the duties of physicians.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.*

Westminster, 1229.

WESTMINSTER. Held in 1229, under master Stephen, chaplain and nuncio of the pope, who, sorely to the discomfort of the assembly, demanded on the part of Rome the tenths of all moveables belonging to clergy and laity in England, Ireland, and Wales, in order to enable the Roman pontiff to carry on war against the excommunicated emperor Frederick. The arguments by which, assuming Rome as the head of all churches, it was asserted that her fall would involve the ruin of the members, was met on the part of the laity by a plain refusal; and the clergy, after three or four days' deliberation, and no small murmuring, were at length brought to consent from fear of excommunication or an interdict being the consequence of disobedience to the demand.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 622.

Wexford, 1240.

WEXFORD. [*Concilium Wexfordiense.*] Held in 1240, by the bishop of Ferns, in which it was ruled how the debts of deceased curates should be paid. Clerks were forbidden to follow any kind of secular business. The infringers of ecclesiastical liberties, intruders into benefices, incendiaries, poisoners, false witnesses, &c., were excommunicated. Curates were forbidden to excommunicate their parishioners without the bishop's sanction.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 681. *Mansi, Supp.* tom. ii. col. 1065.

Whitby, or Strenechal. 664.

WHITBY (or STRENECHAL). [*Concilium Pharense.*] Held in 664. This was properly a conference between the English and Scotch bishops on the subject of the celebration of Easter. There were present on the English side Agilbert, a Frenchman, bishop of Dorchester, with his presbyter, Agatho; Wilfred, a young Northumbrian priest, who had studied at Rome; Romanus, who had before contended the point with Finan, late bishop of Lindisfarne; and an old deacon, James, whom Paulinus had left thirty years before. On the Scotch side were Colman, bishop of Lindisfarne; and

Cedda, a bishop, who acted as interpreter. Oswy, king of Northumbria, was also present, who opened the proceedings, and desired Colman to explain the nature and origin of the rites which his Church had so long practised. The Scots alleged the example of S. John, Wilfred that of S. Peter, and concluded his address in the following terms: "But for you (Colman) and your adherents, if, after having heard the decrees of the apostolic see, yea, of the whole Church, and these, too, confirmed by Scripture, you refuse to obey them, you certainly are guilty of sin. For, allowing your fathers to have been holy men, is their small handful in a corner of a remote island, to be compared to the Church of Christ over the whole earth? And great as that Columba of yours may have been, is he to be preferred to the blessed prince of the apostles, to whom the Lord said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven?'" This fortunate quotation from Holy Scripture determined the king in favour of the Roman custom; he, as he said, fearing to contradict one who held the keys of heaven, and might peradventure refuse to open to him when he knocked.

In this council, moreover, the affair of the tonsure was discussed, the Roman fashion differing from that in use amongst the Scotch, which the former pretended had been derived from Simon Magus.—Tom. vi. Conc. p. 491. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 37.

Winchester, 856 (or 855, *Wilkins*).

WINCHESTER. [*Concilium Wintoniense.*] Held in 856, in the presence of three kings. It was enacted, that in future the tenth part of all lands should belong to the Church, free of all burdens, as an indemnification for the losses sustained by the incursion of the Normans who had ravaged England.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 243. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 184.

Winchester, 975 (or 968, *Wharton*).

WINCHESTER. Held in 975, by S. Dunstan, in consequence of the disturbances raised by certain clerks, whom he had deprived of their churches on account of marriage and scandalous life. The well-known incident of the image of our crucified Saviour having decided in favour of the monks, is said to have occurred in this council. The clerks were condemned, and implored the intercession of the young king Edward, who entreated Dunstan to re-establish them, but in vain.—

Tom. ix. Conc. p. 721. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 261.

WINCHESTER. Held in 1021, under king Canute, to confirm the exemption of the abbey of S. Edmund. —Tom. ix. Conc. p. 843. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 297. Winchester, 1021.

WINCHESTER. Held on the octave of Easter, 1070, in the presence of William the Conqueror. The three legates of Rome, Hermenfride, bishop of Syon, and the cardinals, John and Peter, presided. Stigand of Canterbury was deposed, (1) for having retained the bishopric of Winchester together with the archbishopric of Canterbury; (2) for having worn the pall of his predecessor Robert, until the pope sent him a new one; and (3) for having received the pall from the anti-pope, Benedict X. Agelmar, bishop of the East Angles, and several abbots were also deposed. Walfred, bishop of Worcester, claimed from William certain lands belonging to his bishopric which the latter had withheld, and the claim was allowed. Thirteen canons were published. Winchester, 1070.

1. Concerning the coming in of bishops and abbots by simoniacal heresy.

2. Of ordaining men promiscuously, and by means of money.

3. Of the life and conversation of such men.

4. That bishops should celebrate councils twice a year.

5. That bishops ordain archdeacons and other ministers of the sacred order in their own churches.

6. That bishops have free power in their dioceses over the clergy and laity.

7. That bishops and priests invite laymen to penance.

8. Of apostatizing clerks and monks.

9. That bishops have their sees ascertained, and that none conspire against the prince.

10. That laymen pay tithes, as it is written.

11. That none invade the goods of the Church.

12. That no clerk shall bear secular arms.

13. That clerks and monks be duly reverenced, let him that does otherwise be anathema.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons, in ann.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1202. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. 322.

WINCHESTER. Held probably in 1071, by archbishop Lanfranc. Sixteen canons were published, the heads only of which remain to us. Winchester, 1071.

1. That no one be allowed to preside over two bishoprics.

2. That no one be ordained by means of simoniacal heresy.

3. That foreign clergymen be not received without letters commendatory.

4. That ordinations be performed at the certain seasons.

5. Of altars, that they be of stone.

6. That the sacrifice be not of beer, or water alone, but of wines mixed with water only.

7. Of baptism, that it be celebrated at Easter or Whitsuntide only, except there be danger of death.

8. That masses be not celebrated in churches before they have been consecrated.

9. That the corpses of the dead be not buried in churches.

10. That the bells be not tolled at celebrating in the time of the Secret (Secretum Missæ [2]).

11. That bishops only give penance for gross sins.

12. That monks who have thrown off their habit, be admitted neither into the army, nor into any convent of clerks, but be esteemed excommunicated.

13. That every bishop celebrate a synod once a year.

14. That tithes be paid by all.

15. That clergymen observe continence, or desist from their office.

16. That chalices be not of wax or wood.

It was probably resolved in this council that an institution of penance for the soldiers of William of Normandy, left by the legate Hermenfride, should be executed. It is in thirteen heads.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons*, 1078. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 365.

Winchester, 1072.

WINCHESTER. Convoked by William the Conqueror, and held in 1072; fifteen bishops were present, with Hubert, the Roman legate, and many abbots and barons. The dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York was examined with care, and it was established both from ecclesiastical history and by popular tradition, that from the time of S. Augustine till the

[2] Secretum Missæ is the canon of the Mass before the elevation. The bells were rung as soon as the consecration was finished, in order to excite the people to prayer. The adoration of the host was unknown at this time, but it came in shortly after. *Johnson.*

last one hundred and forty years, the primacy of the see of Canterbury over the whole of Great Britain had been recognized; that the archbishop of Canterbury had often held ordinations and synods in the very city of York itself. At the following Whitsuntide it was also decided in a synod held at Windsor, that the see of York was subject to that of Canterbury.—Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1211. *(Anglicanum.)* *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 324.

WINCHESTER. Held in 1076, by archbishop Lanfranc. Six canons were published. Winchester, 1076.

1. Forbids canons to have wives. Enacts that such priests as live in castles and villages, be not forced to dismiss their wives if they have them. Forbids such as have no wives to marry, and bishops to ordain in future any who do not declare that they have no wife.

2. Forbids to receive a clerk or monk without letters from his bishop.

3. Forbids the clergy to pay any service for his benefice but what he paid in the time of king Edward.

4. Laymen accused of any crime, to be excommunicated after the third summons to appear before the bishop, if they refuse.

5. Declares a marriage made without the priest's benediction, to be a state of fornication.

6. Forbids all supplantation[3] of churches.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. x. Conc. p. 351. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 367.

WINCHESTER. Held August 29, 1139, under archbishop Theodore, against king Stephen, who had seized upon certain houses belonging to the churches of Salisbury and Lincoln, and thrown the two prelates into prison. Stephen himself was cited to appear before the council. Henry, bishop of Winchester, the pope's legate, complained of the injury done to the cause of religion by those who plundered the property of the Church upon the plea of the ill conduct of the bishops. He required that the king should begin by re-establishing the injured bishops, who, by the common law, were incapacitated from pleading on account of their seizure. The king sent a warning to the bishops, that none of Winchester, 1139.

[3] "Supplantation of Churches," i. e. stripping them of their endowments, upon the plea of their having no written document to show, which but few of the holders of the old Saxon foundations could do.

them should have the boldness to make complaint to Rome against him. Upon this, the council broke up without settling any thing, for the king refused to submit to the judgment of the prelates, and the latter did not think it advisable to employ ecclesiastical censures against him upon their own responsibility, and surrounded as they were by his power.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 419. Tom. x. Conc. p. 1014.

Winchester, 1143. WINCHESTER. Held in 1143, on the Monday after the octave of Easter, by Henry, bishop of Winchester, legate a latere. Two constitutions were published.

1. Declares that none who violated a church or churchyard, or laid violent hands upon a clerk or religious person, should be absolved by any person but the pope.

2. Declares that the plough and husbandman in the field should enjoy the same peace as if they were in the churchyard.

All who opposed these decrees were excommunicated with candles lighted.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 421. *Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. x. Conc. p. 1024.

Windsor, 1070. WINDSOR. [*Concilium Windoriense*, or *Windleshorense.*] Held on Whit-Sunday, 1070, in which Agelric, bishop of the South Saxons, was deprived, and committed to prison at Marlborough; no crime was imputed to him, and the sole object of the proceeding seems to have been to make room for a Norman. Several abbots were in like manner deposed at the same time.—*Johnson, Ecc. Canons.* Tom. ix. Conc. p. 1203.

Windsor, 1114. WINDSOR. Held in 1114, April 26; in which Ralph, bishop of Rochester, was elected to the see of Canterbury, vacant during the five preceding years.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 793.

Wirtzburg, 1287. WIRTZBURG. [*Concilium Herbipolense.*] Held March 18, 1287, in the presence of the emperor Rudolph, by the legate, John, bishop of Tusculum, assisted by four archbishops, viz. those of Mayence, Cologne, Saltzburg, and Vienna, some of their suffragans, and many abbots. Forty-two canons were published.

The first five relate to the moral conduct and manner of life of clerks. Enjoins them not to frequent taverns, nor play with dice, and to dress according to their calling.

7. Forbids to celebrate two masses in one day, except in a case of necessity.

8. Orders that the Body of our Lord shall be carried with proper solemnity to the sick, and to women near the time of their delivery.

10. Forbids to hold two vicarages.

14. Orders those who have received investiture at the hands of laymen, to resign their benefices into the bishop's hands, to whom the collation properly belongs.

15. Forbids any fee for the nuptial benediction and for funerals.

28. Forbids to fortify a church without the bishop's consent.

29. Forbids to excommunicate wives or mothers on account of their deceased husband's or children's debts, except they have succeeded to their property.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 1318.

WORCESTER. [*Concilium Wigorniense.*] Held about 601, by S. Augustine, in which he endeavoured, ineffectually, to persuade the bishops of the British Church to observe the festival of Easter and to administer baptism according to the custom of the Latin Church, and to yield obedience to the Church of Rome.—Tom. v. Conc. p. 1610. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 24. Worcester, 601.

WORCESTER. Held July 26, 1240, by the bishop Walter of Chanteloup. Fifty-nine constitutions were published, which, amongst other things, enjoin to baptize conditionally in doubtful cases, but always with trine immersion. Forbids to celebrate mass before having said prime, to plight troth except when fasting, and to observe any particular day or month for marriage. It is also ordered that any person desiring to confess to any other than his own priest, shall first modestly ask permission of the latter.—Tom. xi. Conc. p. 572. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i. p. 665. Worcester, 1240.

WORMS. [*Concilium Vormatiense.*] Held in 829. Several regulations were published, one of which condemns the ordeal by cold water: a treatise written by Agobard against these practices is still extant.—Tom. vii. Conc. p. 1669. Worms, 829.

WORMS. Held May 16, 868, in the presence of Louis of Germany, to which all the bishops of his kingdom were cited. Having drawn up a confession of faith, in which the procession of the Holy Spirit from Worms, 868.

Worms, 868. the Father and the Son was clearly stated, the council proceeded to publish forty-four canons [4].

1. Forbids to administer holy baptism except at Easter and Whitsuntide, unless in a case of necessity.

2. Orders that the chrism be consecrated by the bishop only.

3. Forbids bishops to exact any fee or present for the consecration of a church; also forbids them to consecrate any church except there be a writing under the hand of the founder, confirming the foundation, and signifying what endowment he has given [5].

4. Forbids to offer upon the altar for the eucharist anything save bread, and wine mixed with water. States that wine and water should be used, "quia videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi," and thus, by the union of the water with the wine, the union of Christ with his Church.

5. Approves the regulations of S. Gregory, upon the subject of single and trine immersion.

6. Gives to the bishop, and not to the founders, the disposal of the revenues of new churches.

7. Orders that all offerings and revenues belonging to a church be divided into four portions; one for the bishop, the second for the clerks serving the church, (according to their zeal and diligence), the third for the poor, and the fourth to the fabric.

9. Orders the celibacy of the clergy.

13, 14. Forbids excommunication, without weighty and sufficient cause, and declares that the bishop so excommunicating without sufficient cause, shall be deprived of the communion of the neighbouring bishops.

15. [6] Enacts that when a robbery shall have been committed in any monastery, the thief being unknown, the abbot or some other priest shall celebrate mass, at which all the inmates shall attend, in order by this to prove severally their innocence.

16. Excommunicates bishops who refuse to attend synods, or who retire before the conclusion of business.

[4] Labbe adds thirty-six more, which, however, appear to have been enacted in some other council held at Worms.

[5] The canon concludes thus: "Nam non levis est ista temeritas, si sine luminaribus, vel sine substantiali sustentatione eorum qui ibidem servaturi sunt, tanquam domus privata, consecretur ecclesia."

[6] This canon is by some considered to be spurious.

17. Orders bishops keeping sporting dogs, or birds, to be suspended for three months; a priest, two; and a deacon, one.

19. Excommunicates and suspends priests who refuse to obey their bishop.

22. Forbids those who having been in their infancy offered by their parents to some monastery, for the service of God, and who have been accordingly brought up to the regular life, when they come to the age of puberty, to renounce that life, and return into the world.

26. Declares that a man who has murdered a priest shall neither eat meat nor drink wine, but fast on every day except festivals, till the evening; that he shall never carry arms, never go except on foot, nor enter a church for the space of five years; after which, he may enter the church, but shall still not be received to communion. At the expiration of ten years he may be received, but shall fast three times a-week to his life's end.

28. Orders that a madman who has killed any one shall be put to a light penance should he ever recover his senses.

31. Orders that the holy eucharist be given to lepers.—Tom. viii. Conc. p. 941.

WORMS. Held September 8, 1122. The emperor, in the assembly, renounced his claim to confer investiture by the ring and staff, and the pope confirmed to him the right of conferring the regalia, by the sceptre.—Tom. x. Conc. p. 889. Worms, 1122.

Y.

YORK. [*Concilium Eboracense.*] Held on the 14th and 15th of June, 1195, in the church of S. Peter at York, by Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury, legate and chancellor of England. No other bishop was present in the council, which was attended by Simon the dean of the church, the precentor, the archdeacons of Nottingham and Cleveland, the chancellor, Robert, the provost of Beverley, and some of the canons, with almost all the abbots, priors, officials, deans, and pastors of the churches in the diocese of York. Pope Celestine III. appears to have suspended Geoffry, archbishop of York, (son of the fair Rosamond,) from the exercise of York, 1195.

York, 1195. all his episcopal functions, and a few years before had cut off from his province the whole of Scotland, which he made immediately subject to the see of Rome. Nineteen constitutions were published.

1. Relates to the administration of the holy communion; directs that the minister shall take care that bread, wine, and water, be provided for the sacrifice, that it shall not be celebrated without a lettered minister, that the host be kept in a decent Pyx, and renewed every Lord's day.

2. Directs that the host be carried to the sick with suitable solemnity.

3. Orders archdeacons to take care that the canons of the mass be corrected according to some approved copy.

4. Forbids to impose masses as part of penance, in order to obtain money for saying them. Forbids also priests to make bargains for celebrating masses.

5. Ordains that no more than two or three persons shall take a child out of the sacred font; that a child found exposed shall be baptized, whether it be found with salt or without, for that cannot be said to be iterated which was not known to have been done before.

6. Forbids deacons, except in cases of urgent necessity, to baptize, administer the body of Christ, or enjoin penance at confession. Charges priests, when desired to baptize a child, or administer the communion to the sick, to make no delay.

7. Directs that parsons and vicars shall take care that their churches are kept in proper repair.

8. Directs that in all ministrations the proper ornaments shall be used.

9. Orders that the chalice shall be of silver.

10. Orders all clerks to preserve their crown and tonsure, under pain of losing their benefices, if they have any, and of being forcibly clipped by the archdeacon or dean, if they have not.

11. Forbids priests to go about in copes with sleeves; orders them to wear suitable apparel.

12. Forbids any money to be taken by the judge in ecclesiastical causes.

13. Orders that the tithe be paid to the church first, before the wages of the harvestmen, &c.

14. Forbids monks to take estates to farm, and to leave their houses without reasonable cause.

15. Forbids nuns to leave the verge of their monastery, unless in the company of their abbess or prioress.

16. Forbids laymen to farm churches or tithes.

17. Orders that every priest shall annually excommunicate, with candles and bells, those who forswear themselves.

18. Requires priests to abstain from drinking bouts, and taverns. Forbids them, under pain of suspension, to keep concubines in their own houses, or in the houses of others.

19. Orders that when any one is suspected of a crime on public report, the dean of the place shall familiarly admonish him thrice; if he do not thereupon reform, the dean shall reprove him in conjunction with two or three more with whom he hath lost his reputation; if he cannot be reformed by this means, the dean shall bring the matter before the chapter, in order that the accused may be either punished, or canonically purged.—*Wilkins, Conc.* vol. i., p. 501. *Johnson, Eccl. Canons,* Tom. x. Conc. p. 1791.

YORK. Held about the year 1363, by John Thorsby, archbishop of York. Five fresh constitutions were published, and seven constitutions published by archbishop Zouche in a provincial synod held at Thorp, in 1347, confirmed. York, 1363.

1. Forbids to hold markets, pleadings, &c., in churches, churchyards, and other holy places, on the Lord's-day, or other holy days.

2. Forbids the performance of plays and vanities in churches on vigils.

3. Relates to the salaries to be assigned to stipendiary priests and chaplains, and renews a constitution made by William Greenfield, archbishop of York, which assigns a salary of not less than five marks. Also renews the seven constitutions made by archbishop Zouche, at Thorp, in 1347, viz.

1. Relating to the stipends to be assigned to assisting priests, &c. 2. Concerning the overlaying of children. 3. Concerning the obstruction offered by tithepayers to those who take it, and declares that some hindered the tithe-owner from carrying it by the accustomable way, and compelled him to take it by intricate and round-about paths; others forbad him to carry it

until all their own corn was carried, and maliciously permitted the tithe to be trampled upon and destroyed. 4. Forbids to give away property at death to the injury of the Church's rights, and those of the king's relations, &c. 5. Forbids priests to wear ridiculous clothes, and to seek glory from their shoes; declares that many priests did, "out of an affection to show their shapes," in defiance of the canons, wear clothes so short as not to come down to the knees. 6. Relates to the trying of matrimonial causes. 7. Forbids clandestine marriages, and orders that the banns be published on three several solemn days.

4. States how the above statute was in some particulars modified in another provincial council.

5. Specifies for the guidance of rectors, vicars, and other confessors, thirty-seven cases, which were to be reserved, either for the judgment of the archbishop, and his penitentiary, or for that of the pope; and orders, that in each of these cases, the offender shall be sent to the archbishop, or his penitentiary, unless he be in danger of death, with letters granted to him free of cost, explaining his case.—*Johnson, Eccl. Canons.* Tom. xi. Conc. Appen. 2482.

York, 1444. YORK. Held in 1444, by John Kemp, archbishop of York, and cardinal of Balbina, in a provincial synod. Two constitutions were published.

1. Is with little variation the same with the fifth constitution of Merton, A.D. 1305.

2. Lays certain restrictions upon the sale of trees, woodlands, &c., and upon the granting of rights, rents, pensions, &c., by abbots, priors, and other administrators of church goods.—*Johnson, Eccl. Canons.*

York, 1466. YORK. Held April 26, 1466, in the metropolitan church of York, by George Neville, archbishop. From various causes connected with the state and liberty of the Church, it was assembled without a royal brief. Eleven constitutions were published.

1. Is the same with the ninth constitution of Lambeth, A.D. 1281.

2. Is the same with the fifth constitution of London, A.D. 1343.

3. Is the same with the ninth constitution of London, A.D. 1343.

4 and 5. Are the same with the twelfth constitution

of London, A.D. 1343, *mutatis mutandis*, against the obstructors of ecclesiastical process. York, 1466.

6. Is the same with the last constitution of London, A.D. 1343.

7. Declares that some questors[7], in defiance of the decrees of the council of Lateran, 1215, had, with extreme impudence, granted indulgences to the people of their own will, had dispensed with vows, absolved for murders; had, for a sum of money, relaxed a third and fourth part of the penance enjoined, had falsely affirmed that they had drawn out of purgatory three or more souls of the parents or friends of those who had given them alms, and conveyed them to the joys of paradise; that they had, moreover, absolved such as had been excommunicated by the ecclesiastical judges, buried suicides in the church-yards, and done all sorts of like abominations. Orders, in consequence, that the decrees of Lateran and Vienne, (A.D. 1312,) which restricted the operations of the questors, to be rigidly enforced, and subjects to a fine of forty shillings, any rector, vicar, &c., who shall admit any such questor to preach contrary to the form prescribed. The fine to be applied to the fabric of the cathedral church of York.

8. Declares parishioners who attend a chapel of ease instead of their parish church, and contribute to the repair of it, shall nevertheless be held bound to contribute to the fabric of the mother church, and to support the other burdens thereof, at the discretion of the ordinary; and orders further, that if they refuse so to contribute, the said chapels shall be interdicted, and no service performed in them.

9. Forbids abbots, priors, and provosts, to permit any of the religious belonging to their several houses, to dwell alone out of the verge of their monasteries, in their manors, or churches, under penalty of paying forty shillings towards the fabric of York Minster. The religious vagabond himself to be deemed an apostate.

10. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, any ecclesiastical or secular person, to arrest, cite, force out, or cause to be arrested, cited, or forced out, any

[7] "Questors," or "pardon-mongers,"—friars employed to dispense pardons and indulgences, under certain restrictions. This abuse, which subsequently rose to a great height, was abolished in the council of Trent, sess. v. c. 2; sess. xxv. c. 9.

man that is in church, during the celebration of the Divine offices.

11. Is the same with the fifth constitution of Merton, A.D. 1305, except that no mention is made of the tithe of wine, whereas it speaks of the tithe of coal where it is dug, and of the tithe of saffron.

After these constitutions follow the constitutions of archbishop Kemp, published in 1444, as given in the preceding council.—*Johnson, Eccl. Canons*, Tom. xiii. Conc. p. 1423. *Wilkins, Conc.* vol. iii. p. 599.

Z.

Zella, 418. ZELLA. [*Concilium Tellense* or *Teleptense.*] Held in 418, at Zella, or Tella, in the province of Byzacena, in Africa, Donatianus, bishop of Zella, presiding. Various regulations were made.

1. Enacts that no man shall be admitted to holy orders who has served in war after baptism.

2. Enacts that every bishop shall be consecrated by three bishops, with the consent of the metropolitan, and that of the bishops of the provinces, expressed in writing.

3. Declares that one bishop only cannot consecrate another, except in the Roman church.

4. Exhorts bishops, priests, &c., to observe continence.

8. Directs that the Montanists and Novatianists shall be admitted into the Church by imposition of hands.—Tom. ii. Conc. p. 1577.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX I.

An INDEX *to* LATIN NAMES OF PLACES *in which Councils have been held, giving their Modern Designations and Ecclesiastical Situations; compiled from the "Géographie des Conciles" of the Abbé Dufresnoy, and the Index of Labbe and Cossart.*

The Latin names of places now extinct, which, therefore, have no corresponding modern name, and many of those which exactly correspond with the modern name, are, for the sake of brevity, omitted. When the modern name of any place is uncertain, an asterisk (*) is annexed to it.

The ecclesiastical situation of some places, owing to the changes which from time to time have taken place, dioceses, &c., will be found to vary at different periods; this has, as far as was possible, been noticed. Thus Turin, which was at one time a bishopric in the province of Milan, is now itself an archiepiscopal see, which is expressed thus :—

	PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.
Turin	Milan, now Turin	Turin.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
ABRINCÆ	Avranches	France	Rouen	Avranches	C. Abrincense.
Ædua, or Augustodunum	Autun	Burgundy	Lyons	Autun	C. Augustodunense, or Æduense.
S. Ægidii fanum	S. Gilles	France	Narbonne	Nimes	C. apud S. Ægidium.
Ænhamum	Ensham	England	Canterbury	Oxford	C. Ænhamense.

Agatha	Agde	France	Narbonne	Agde	C. Agathense.
Agaunum	S. Maurice	. . . . .	. . . . .	Syon in Valais	C. Agaunense.
Agrippina, see Colonia A.					
Albia	Albi	Languedoc	Albi	. . . . .	C. Albiense.
Altemium	Altheim	Alsace	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Altheimense.
Altinum	Altino	Italy	Aquilea	Altino	C. Altinense.
Ambianum	Amiens.				
Andegavum	Angers	Anjou	Tours	Angers	C. Andegavense.
Ansa	Anse	France	. . . . .	Lyons	C. Ansanum.
Aquæ-Grani, or Aquis Granum	Aix-la-Chapelle	. . . . .	. . . . .	Liege	C. Aquisgranense.
Aqua Sextia	Aix	Provence	Aix	. . . . .	C. Aquense.
Aquileia	Aquilea	Italy	Aquilea	. . . . .	C. Aquiliense.
Arausio	Orange	Provence	Arles	Orange	C. Arausicanum.
Arelate	Arles	Provence	Arles	. . . . .	C. Arelatense.
Armachia	Armagh	Ireland	Armagh	. . . . .	C. Armachiense.
Arrebata	Arras	France	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Arrebatense.
Arvernia	Auvergne	France	Bourges	Auvergne	C. Arvernense.
Asturica	Astorga	Spain	Lugo in Galicia	Astorga	C. Asturicense.
Attiniacum	Attigni	Champagne	. . . . .	Rheims	C. Attiniacense.
Avenio	Avignon	Provence	Avignon	. . . . .	C. Avenionense.
Audomaropolis	S. Omer	Artois	Cambrai	S. Omer	C. Audomarense.
Augusta Vindelicorum	Augsburg	Suabia	Mayence	Augsburg	C. Augustanum.
Augustodunum, see Ædna.					
Aurelia	Orleans	France	Sens, now Paris	Orleans	C. Aurelianense.
Ausci or Auxum	Auch	Gascony	Auch	. . . . .	C. Auscense.
Autissiodorus	Auxerre	France	Sens	Auxerre	C. Autissiodorense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
BALGENCIACUM	Beaugenci	France	Sens now Paris	Orleans	C. Balgenciacense.
Barcinona	Barcelona	Catalonia	Tarragona	. . . . .	C. Barcinonense.
Barium	Bari	on the Adriatic	Bari	. . . . .	C. Barense.
Basilea	Basle	Switzerland	Besançon	Basle	C. Basiliense.
Becancelda	Bapchild	Kent	Canterbury	. . . . .	C. Becanceldense.
Bellovacum	Beauvais	France	Rheims	Beauvais	C. Belvacense.
Benningdona	Beningdon*	in Mercia	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Benningdonense.
Berghamstedum	Bursted near Maidstone	Kent	Canterbury	Canterbury	C. Berghamstedense.
Bisuntium, see Vesontio.					
Biterræ	Besiers	Languedoc	Narbonne	Besiers	C. Biterrense.
Biturigæ or Bituricæ	Bourges	Guienne	Bourges	. . . . .	C. Bituricense.
Bonna	Bonn	on the Rhine	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Bonnense.
Bononia	Bologna	Italy	Bologna	. . . . .	C. Bononiense.
Bostra	Boussereth	Arabia	Antioch	. . . . .	C. Bostrenum.
Bracara Augusta	Braga	Portugal	Braga	. . . . .	C. Bracarense.
Brandanfordia	Brentford*	England	Canterbury	London	C. Brandanfordiense.
Brixia	Bresse	Italy	Milan	Bresse	C. Brixiense.
Burdegala	Bourdeaux	France	Bourdeaux	. . . . .	C. Burdegalense.
CABILLO	Chalons sur Saône	Burgundy	Lyons	Chalons sur Saône	C. Cabilonense.
Cadomus	Caen	Normandy		Bayeux	C. Cadomense.
Cæsaraugusta	Sarragossa	Arragon	Sarragossa	. . . . .	C. Cæsaraugustanum.

Cala	Chelles	on the Marne	Sens, now Paris	Paris	C. Calense.
Calchutum	Kelcheth*	Lancashire	York	Chester	C. Calchutense.
Calna	Calne	Wiltshire	Canterbury	Salisbury	C. Calnense.
Cameracum	Cambrai	French Flanders	Cambrai	. . . . .	C. Cameracense.
Campaniacum or Copriniacum	Cognac	France	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Copriniacense.
Cantuaria or Dorovernum	Canterbury	Kent	Canterbury	. . . . .	C. Cantuariense.
Carisiacum	Chiersy or Cressy	on the Serre	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Carisiacense.
Carnotum	Chartres	France	Paris, formerly Sens	Chartres	C. Carnotense.
Carpentoracte	Carpentras	. . . . .	Avignon, formerly Arles	Carpentras	C. Carpentoractense.
Carrofum	Charroux	Poitou	Bourdeaux	Poitiers	C. Carrofense.
Cassilia	Cashel	Ireland	Dublin, formerly Cashel	Cashel	C. Cassiliense.
Castrum Gonterii	Château-Gontier	on the Maine	Tours	Angers	C. apud Castrum Gonteriense.
Castrum Theodorici	Château Thierri	France	Rheims	Soissons	C. apud Castrum Theodoriciense.
Catalanum	Châlons sur Marne	Champagne	Rheims	Chalons-sur-Marne	C. Catalaunense.
Cenomanum	Mans	Maine	Tours	Mons	C. Cenomanense.
Cirta	Certes or Constantine	Numidia	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Cirtense.
Claromontium	Clermont	Auvergne	Bourges	Clermont	C. Claromontanum.
Clipiacum	Clichy near Paris	on the Seine	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Clipiacense.
Cloveshovia	Cloveshoo*	England	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Cloveshonense.
Colonia Agrippina	Cologne	on the Rhine	Cologne	. . . . .	C. Coloniense.
Compendium	Compiegne	France	Rheims	Soissons	C. Compendiense.
Complutum	Alcala	Toledo	Toledo	Toledo	C. Complutense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Confluentes	Coblentz	on the Rhine	Treves	Treves	C. Confluentinum.
Constantia	Constance	Germany	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Constantiense.
Copriniacum, see Campiniacum.					
Corduba	Cordova	Spain	Seville	Cordova	C. Cordubense.
Coyacum	Coyaco	Asturia	Compostella	Oviedo	C. Coyacense.
Dertusa	Tortosa	Catalonia	Tarragona	Tortosa	C. Dertusanum.
Diampera	Diamper	Coromandel	Meliapor	. . . . .	C. Diamperense.
Dionysiopolis	S. Denys	near Paris	Sens, now Paris	Paris	C. apud S. Dionysium.
Divio	Dijon	Burgundy	Lyons	Dijon, formerly in the diocese of Langres	C. Divionense.
Duziacum	Douzi	Champagne	. . . . .	Rheims.	C. Duziacense.
Eboracum	York	England	York	. . . . .	C. Eboracense.
Ebredunum	Embrun	France	Embrun	. . . . .	C. Ebredunense.
Edua, see Augustodunum.					
Eliberis	Elvira	Spain	Seville	Elvira	C. Eliberitanum.
Emerita Augusta	Merida	Spain	Merida, transferred to Compostella	. . . . .	C. Emeritense.
Engilenheim	Engelheim	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Engilenheimense.
Epao or Epauna	Epaone	Provence	Vienne	Vienne	C. Epaonense.

Erphordia	Erfort	Thuringia	Mayence	. . . . .	C. Erphordiense.
Exonia	Exeter	England	Canterbury	Exeter	C. Exoniense.
Finchala	Finchal	England	York	Durham	C. Finchalense.
Ad Fines or Macra	Fimes	Champagne	Rheims	Rheims	C. Finibus, or apud S. Macram.
Floriacum	Abbey of Fleury	France	Sens, now Paris	Orleans	C. Floriacense.
Forum Julii	Friuli	Istria	Aquilea	Friuli	C. Forojuliense.
Francfordia	Francfort	on the Maine	Mayence	Mayence	C. Francofordiense.
Frideslaria	Frislat	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Frideslariense.
Fussallanum	Fussel	Spain	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Fussallanense.
Fuxum	Foix	Languedoc	. . . . .	Toulouse	C. Fuxense.
S. Genesius	S. Genez	near Lucca	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. apud S. Genesium.
Gentiliacum	Gentilly	near Paris	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Gentiliacense.
Gerunda	Gerona	Catalonia	Tarragona	Gerona	C. Gerundense.
Glocestria	Gloucester	England	Canterbury	Gloucester	C. Glocestriense.
Gratelea	Grateley	England	Canterbury	Winton	C. Grateleanum.
Hafnia	Copenhagen	Denmark	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Hafniense.
Hedtfeldia	Hatfield	Hertfordshire.	Canterbury	Lincoln	C. Hedtfeldense.
Helena	Elne	Rousillon	. . . . .	formerly a bishopric, now diocese of Perpignan	C. Helenense.
Herbipolis or Virceburgum	Wurzburg	on the Maine	Mayence	Wurzburg	C. Herbipolense.
Herudfordia	Hertford	Hertfordshire	Canterbury	Lincoln	C. Herudfordiense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Hierosolyma	Jerusalem	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Hierosolymitanum.
Hispalis	Seville	Andalusia	Seville	. . . . .	C. Hispalense.
Iacca	Iaca	Arragon	Saragossa	Iaca	C. Iaccetanum.
Ilerda	Lerida	Catalonia	Tarragona	Lerida	C. Ilerdense.
Insula	Lille	Provence	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Insulanum.
Iotrum	Tonarre	near the Marne	Sens, now Paris	Meaux	C. Iotrense.
Juliobona	Lillebonne	Normandy	Rouen	Rouen	C. Juliobonense.
Kingsburia	Kingsbury	Dorsetshire	Canterbury	Salisbury	C. Kingsburiense.
Kingostonium	Kingston	on the Thames	Canterbury	Winchester	C. Kingstoniense.
Kirtlingtonium	Kirtlington	England	Canterbury	Oxford	C. Kirtlingtoniense.
Lambetha	Lambeth	near London	Canterbury	Winchester	C. Lambethense.
Lancicia	Lanciski	Poland	. . . . .	Gnesen	C. Lanciciense.
Landava	Landaff	Glamorganshire	Canterbury	Landaff	C. Landavense.
Langesium	Langeais	Tourraine	Tours	. . . . .	C. Langesiense.
Lateranum, formerly Basilica Constantiniana	Lateran, the first Patriarchal Church of Rome, now Church of S. John	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Lateranense.
Latiniacum	Lagni	on the Marne	Sens, now Paris	Paris	C. Latiniacense

Laudanum, or Lugdunum Clavatum	Laon	Picardy	Rheims	Laon	C. Laudunense.
Lauriacum	Lorris	Anjou	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Lauriacense.
Laus Pompeia	Lodi	Lombardy	Milan	Lodi	C. Laudense.
Lausdunum	Loudan	Poitou	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Lausdunense.
Legio	Leon	Spain	Compostella, formerly Braga	Leon	C. Legionense.
Lemovicæ	Limoges	Limosin	Bourges	Limoges	C. Lemovicense.
Leodium	Liege	on the Meuse	Cologne	Liege	C. Leodiense.
Lexovium	Lisieux	Normandy	Rouen	Lisieux	C. Lexoviense.
Lincolnia	Lincoln	England	Canterbury	Lincoln	C. Lincolniense.
Lingacopa	Linkoping	Gothland	Upsala	Linkoping	C. Lincopense.
Lingonæ	Langres	Champagne	Lyons	Langres	C. Lingonense.
Liptinæ	Leptines	Hainault	Cambray	Cambray	C. Liptinense.
Lotharingia	Lorraine.				
Lucus	Lugo	Galicia	Compostella	Lugo, formerly metropolitan	C. Lucense.
Lugdunum	Lyons	France	Lyons	. . . . .	C. Lugdunense.
Lumbaria	Lombez	Languedoc	Toulouse	Alby	C. Lumbariense.
Lutetia	Paris.				
Macra, see Ad Fines.					
Magalona	Maguelona	Island on the coast of Languedoc	Narbonne	Maguelona, see, now transferred to Montpellier	C. Magalonense.
Magdunum	Mehun	on the Loire	. . . . .	Orleans	C. Magdunense.
Magfeldium	Maghfield — Mayfield	England	Canterbury	Chichester	C. Magfeldense.
Mantala	Mantuala	Dauphiné	. . . . .	Vienne	C. Mantalense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Mantua	Mantua	Lombardy	Aquilea	Mantua	C. Mantuanum.
Marchiacum	Marsiac	Gascony	Auch	Auch	C. Marchiacense.
Massilia	Marseilles	Provence	Arles	Marseilles	C. Massiliense.
Matiscona	Mâcon	Burgundy	Lyons	Mâcon	C. Matisconense.
Matritense, or Madritense	Madrid	Spain	Toledo	Madrid	C. Madritense.
S. Maxentii fanum	S. Maxent	France	Bordeaux	Poitiers	C. apud S. Maxentium.
Mechlinia	Malines	Belgium	Malines	. . . . .	C. Mechliniense.
Mediolanum	Milan	Lombardy	Milan	. . . . .	C. Mediolanense.
Mediomatrices, see Metæ.					
Meldi	Meaux	on the Marne	Paris, formerly Sens	Meaux	C. Meldense.
Melodunum	Melun	near Paris	Sens	Melun	C. Melodunense.
Melphis	Melfi	Naples	Manfredonia	Melfi	C. Melphitanum.
Memphis	same with Cairo	Egypt	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Memphiticum.
Mertona	Merton	England	Canterbury	Winchester	C. Mertonense.
Metæ	Metz	Lorraine	Treves	Metz	C. Metense.
Moguntia	Mayence	on the Rhine	Mayence	. . . . .	C. Moguntinum.
Mons-Pessulanus	Montpellier	Languedoc	Narbonne	Montpellier	C. Montispessulani.
Mons S. Mariæ Tardanensis	Mount S. Marie	near Paris	. . . . .	Soissons	C. Montis S. Mariæ Tardanensis.
Moscovia	Moscow	Russia	Moscow	. . . . .	C. Moscoviense.
Mosomum	Mouson	Champagne	. . . . .	Rheims	C. Mosomense.
Mutina	Modena	Lombardy	Bologna, formerly Ravenna	Modena	C. Mutinense.

NANNETES	Nantes	Bretagne	Tours	Nantes	C. Nannetense.
Narbo	Narbonne	Languedoc	Narbonne	. . . . .	C. Narbonense.
Neapolis	Napoli	Palestine	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Neapolitanum.
Nemausus	Nismes	Languedoc	Narbonne	Nismes	C. Nemausense.
Nesterfelda	Nesterfield	England	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Nesterfeldense.
Nidda	River Nid	Northumberland	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Niddanum.
Noviomum	Noyon	Isle of France	Rheims	Noyon	C. Noviomense.
Novus Mercatus	Newmarket, or Neuf Marché	England Normandy	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. apud N. M.
OSCA	Huesca	Arragon	Saragossa, formerly Tarragona	Huesca	C. Oscense.
Oslaveslenum	Oslaveslen*	Kingdom of Mercia	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Oslaveslense.
Ovetum	Oviedo	Asturias	Compostella	Oviedo	C. Ovetense.
Oxonium	Oxford	England	Canterbury	Oxford	C. Oxoniense.
PADERBORNA	Paderborn	Westphalia	Mayence	Paderborn	C. Paderbornense.
Palentia	Palencia	Spain	Burgos, formerly Toledo	Palencia	C. Palentinum.
Pampilona	Pampeluna	Navarre	Burgos, formerly Toledo	Pampeluna	Pampilonense.
Papia, see Ticinum.					
Patavium	Padua	Italy	Aquilea	Padua	C. Patavinum.
Pennafidelis	Pennafiel	Old Castille	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Pennæfidelis.
Perthum	Perth	Scotland	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Perthense.
Pharum	Whitby	Yorkshire	York	York	C. Pharense.
Pictavium	Poitiers	France	Bordeaux	Poitiers	C. Pictavense.
Pipewella	Pipwell Abbey	Northamptonshire	Canterbury	Peterborough	C. Pippewellense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Pisce	Pisa	Tuscany	Pisa	. . . . .	C. Pisanum.
Pisciacum	Poissi	France	Paris	Chartres	C. Pisciacense.
Pistæ	Pistres	near the Seine	. . . . .	Rouen	C. Pistense.
Placentia	Placenza	Lombardy	Bologna, formerly Ravenna	Placenza	C. Placentinum.
Pons Audemari	Pont-Audemer	Normandy	Rouen	Lisieux	C. apud Pontem A.
Posonium	Presburg	Hungary	. . . . .	Gran	C. Posoniense.
Praga	Prague	Bohemia	Prague	. . . . .	C. Pragense.
Ad Quercus	The Oak	A place near Chalcedon, in Bithynia	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. ad Quercum.
Quintinopolis	S. Quentin	Vermandois	Rheims	Noyon	C. Quintinopolitanum.
Radinga	Reading	Berkshire	Canterbury	Oxford	C. Radingense.
Ratisbona, or Reginoburgum	Ratisbon	on the Danube	Salzburg	Ratisbon	C. Ratisponense.
Ravenna, or Emilia	Ravenna	on the Adriatic	Ravenna	. . . . .	C. Ravennate.
Redonce	Rennes	Bretagne	Tours	Rennes	C. Redonense.
Regia Ticina, see Ticinum.					
Regium	Riez	Provence	Aix	Riez	C. Regiense.
Rhemi	Rheims	Champagne	Rheims	. . . . .	C. Remense.
Riga	Riga	Livonia	Riga	. . . . .	C. Rigense.
Rochingamense	Rockingham	Northampton	Canterbury	Peterborough	C. Rochingamense.

Roffa	Rochester	Kent	Canterbury	Rochester	C. Roffense.
Roffiacum, or Rufacum	Ruffec	. . . . .	Bordeaux	Poictiers	C. Roffiacense.
Rothomagus	Rouen	Normandy	Rouen	. . . . .	C. Rotomagense.
S. Rufus	Monastery of S. Ruf.	Dauphiny	Vienne	Valence	
SABLONARIÆ, see Saponariæ.					
Salegunstadium	Selengsted	Monastery in Franconia	Mayence	Mayence	C. Salegunstadiense.
Salisburgum, or Juvavia	Salzburg	Austria	Salzburg	. . . . .	C. Salisburgense.
Salmurium	Saumur	Anjou	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Salmuriense.
Santones	Saintes	France	Bordeaux	Saintes	C. Santonense.
Saponarice	Savonieres	Lorraine	Treves	Toul	C. ad Saponarias.
Sarum	Salisbury	England	Canterbury	Salisbury	C. Sarumense.
Sauriciacum	Soreze*	an Abbey in Languedoc*	. . . . .	Soissons	C. Sauriciacense.
Scheningia	Schenning	Sweden	Upsala	Linkoping	C. Scheningiense.
Scoanum	Scone	Scotland.			
Sedenum	Seden	. . . . .	Arles	. . . . .	C. Sedenense.
Sedunum	Syon	on the Rhone	Tarentaise	Syon, formerly Martigny	C. Sedunense.
Senæ	Sienna	Tuscany	Sienna	. . . . .	C. Senense.
Senonæ	Sens	Burgundy	Sens	. . . . .	C. Senonense.
Silvanectum	Senlis	Valois.			
Sipontum, or Sipus	Siponto	Italy.			
Spalatium	Spalatro	Dalmatia	Spalatro	. . . . .	C. Spalatrense, or C. Jadrense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Sparnacum	Epernay	on the Marne	Rheims	. . . . .	C. Sparnacense.
Spoletum	Spoletto	States of the Church	. . . . .	Spoletto	C. Spoletanum.
Stampæ	Estampes	France	. . . . .	Sens	C. Stampense.
Suessiones, or Augusta Suessionum	Soissons.	France	Rheims	Soissons	C. Suessionense.
Sutrium	Sutri	Tuscany	Rome	Sutri	C. Sutrinum.
Synnada	Synnada	Phrygia	Ephesus	. . . . .	C. Synadense.
TARRACO	Tarragona	Spain	Tarragona	. . . . .	C. Tarraconense.
Taurinum, or Augusta Taurinorum	Turin	Piedmont	Milan, now Turin	Turin	C. Taurinense.
Theodonis villa	Thionville	Luxemburg	. . . . .	Metz	C. apud Theodonis Villam.
S. Theodericus	S. Thierry	. . . . .	Rheims	. . . . .	C. apud S. Theodoricum.
Ticinum, or Papia	Pavia	Milan	Milan	Pavia	C. Ticinense.
Toletum	Toledo	Spain	Toledo	. . . . .	C. Toletanum.
Tolosa	Toulouse	France	Toulouse	. . . . .	C. Tolosanum.
Tranum	Trani	Naples	Trani	. . . . .	C. Tranense, or Salpense.
Trœcæ, or Augustobona Tricassium	Troyes	on the Seine	Rheims	Troyes	C. Trecense.
Tremonia	Dormond	Westphalia	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Tremoniense.
Trenorchium, or Tornusium	Tourans	on the Saone	. . . . .	Chalons	C. Trenorchianum.

Treviri, or Augusta Trevirorum	Treves	on the Moselle	Treves	. . . . .	C. Trevirense.
Triburia	formerly a palace of the kings of France	on the Rhine	. . . . .	Mayence	C. Triburiense.
Tridentum	Trent	. . . . .	Aquilea	Trent	C. Tridentinum.
Trosleium	Trosby	. . . . .	. . . . .	Soissons	C. Trosleianum.
Tullum	Toul	Lorraine	Treves	Toul	C. Tullense.
Turones, or Cæsarodunum Turonum	Tours	France	Tours	. . . . .	C. Turonense.
Tousiacum	Tousi	near Toul	. . . . .	. . . . .	C. Tusiacense.
Urgellum, or Orgellum	Urgel	Catalonia	Tarragona	Urgel.	
Unie Novia	Uwienov	Poland	. . . . .	Gnesne	C. Unienoviense.
Utica, or Ucetia	Uzes	Languedoc	. . . . .	Uzes	
Valentia Segulaunorum	Valence	Dauphiny	Vienne	Valence	C. Valentinum Galliæ.
Valentia Contestanorum	Valencia	Spain	Toledo, now Valencia	Valencia	C. Valentinum Hisp.
Vallis Oleti	Valladolid	Spain	Toledo	Valladolid	C. Vallisoletanum.
Vasio	Vaison	Provence	Avignon, formerly Arles	Vaison	C. Vasense.
Vaurum	Lavaur	Languedoc	Toulouse	Lavaur	C. Vaurense.
Venetica	Vannes	Bretagne	Tours	Vannes	C. Veneticum.
Venetice	Venice	. . . . .	Patriarchate of Venice	. . . . .	C. Venetum.
Vercellæ	Verceilles	Piedmont	Milan	Verceilles	C. Vercellense.

LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	SITUATION.	ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE.	DIOCESE.	
Vermerice	Verberie	Valois	. . . . .	Soissons	C. Vermeriense.
Vernum	Vernon sur Seine*	. . . . .	. . . . .	Senlis or Rouen *	C. Vernense.
Verodunum, see Virdunum.					
Verulamium	S. Alban's	Herts	Canterbury	London	C. Verulamiense.
Vezeliacum	Vezelai	On the frontiers of Burgundy	. . . . .	Autun	C. Vezeliacense.
Vesontio, or Bisuntium	Bezançon	On the Doux	Bezançon	. . . . .	C. Bisuntinense, or C. Vesontionense.
Vindobona	Vienna	Austria	Vienna	. . . . .	C. Vindobonense, or C. Viennense, in Austria.
Vienna Allobrogum	Vienne	On the Rhone	Vienne	. . . . .	C. Viennense.
Vigornia	Worcester	England	York	Worcester	C. Vigoniense.
Villa Portus	Portes	. . . . .	. . . . .	Rheims.	
Villa Regia					
Vintonia	Winchester	Hampshire	Canterbury	Winchester	C. Vintoniense.
Virdunum or Verodunum	Verdun	Lorraine	Treves	Verdun	C. Virdunense.
Virceburgum, see Herbipolis.					
Vormatia, or Guarmacia	Worms	Germany	Mayence	Worms	C. Vormatiense, or C. apud Guarmatiam.
Vratislavia	Breslau	Silesia	Gnesne	Breslau	C. Vratislaviense.
WESTMONASTERIUM	Westminster	England	Canterbury	London	C. Westmonasteriense.
Windlesoria	Windsor	England	Canterbury	Oxford	C. Windlesoriense.

APPENDIX II.

INDEX *to the* MODERN NAMES *of* PLACES *in which Councils have been held, giving the corresponding* LATIN NAMES.

When the modern name of any place is uncertain, an asterisk (*) is annexed to it.

MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.
AGDE	Agatha.	Besançon	Vesontio.
Aix-la-Chapelle	Aquis-Granum.	Besiers	Biterræ.
		Bologna	Bononia.
Aix, (in Provence)	Aqua Sextia.	Bonn	Bonna.
		Bourdeaux	Burdegala.
S. Albans	Verulamium.	Bourges	Bituricæ.
Albi	Albia.	Boussereth	Bostra.
Alcala	Complutum.	Braga	Bracara-Augusta.
Altheim	Altemium.		
Altino	Altinum.	Brentford*	Brandanfordia.
Angers	Andegavoum		
Anse	Ansa.	Breslau	Vratislavia.
Aquilea	Aquileia.	Bresse	Brixia.
Arles	Arelate.	Bursted	Berghamstedum.
Armagh	Armachia.		
Arras	Arrebata.		
Astorga	Asturica.		
Attigni	Attiniacum.		
Auch	Ausci.	CAEN	Cadomus.
Augsburg	Augusta-Vindelicorum.	Calne	Calna.
		Cambrai	Cameracum.
Autun	Ædua.	Canterbury	Cantuaria.
Auvergne	Arvernia.	Carpentras	Carpentoracte.
Auxerre	Autissiodorus.	Cashel	Cassilia.
Avignon	Avenio.	Chalons-sur-Saôn	Cabillo.
Avranches	Abrincæ.	Chalons-sur-Marne	Catalanum.
BASSCHILD*	Becancelda.	Charroux	Carrofum.
Barcelona	Barcinona.	Chartres	Carnotum.
Bari	Barium.	Château Gontier	CastrumGonterii.
Basle	Basilea.	Château Thierri	Castrum Theodorici.
Beaugenci	Balgenciacum.		
Beauvais	Bellovacum.	Chelles	Cala.
Beningdon*	Benningdona	Chiersy	Carisiacum.

MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.
Clermont	Claromontium.
Clichy	Clipiacum.
Clovesh ov *	Cloveshovia.
Coblentz	Confluentes.
Cognac	Copriniacum.
Cologne	Colonia Agrippina.
Compiegne	Compendium
Constance	Constantia.
Constantine	Cirta.
Copenhagen	Hafnia.
Cordova	Corduba.
Coyaco	Coyacum.
S. Denys	Dionysiopolis
Diamper	Diampera.
Dijon	Divio.
Dormond	Tremonia.
Douzi	Duziacum.
Elne	Helena.
Elvira	Eliberis.
Embrun	Ebredunum.
Ensham	Ænhamum.
Epaone	Epauna.
Epernay	Sparnacum.
Erfort	Erphordia.
Estampes	Stampæ.
Exeter	Exonia.
Firnes	Macra.
Finchal	Finchala.
Fleury	Floriacum.
Foix	Fuxum.
Francfort	Francofordia
Frislat	Frideslaria.
Friuli	Forum Julii.
Fussel	Fussallanum.
S. Genez	S. Genesius.
Gentilly	Gentiliacum.
Gerona	Gerunda.
S. Gilles	S. Ægidii fanum.
Gloucester	Glocestria.
Grathea *	Gratelea.
Hatfield	Hedtfeldia.
Hertford	Herudfordia.
Huesca	Osca.
Jaca	Jacca.
Jerusalem	Hierosolyma.
Jonarre	Jotrum.
Kelcheth *	Calchutum.
Kingsbury	Kingesburia.
Kingston	Kingostonium.
Kirtlington	Kirtlingtonium.
Lagni	Latiniacum.
Lambeth	Lambetha.
Lanciski	Lancicia.
Landaff	Landava.
Langeais	Langesium.
Langres	Lingonæ.
Laon	Laudanum.
Lateran	Lateranum.
Lavaur	Vaurum.
Leon	Legio.
Leptines	Liptinæ.
Lerida	Iterda.
Liege	Leodium.
Lille	Insula.
Lillebonne	Juliobona.
Limoges	Lemovicæ.
Lincoln	Lincolnia.
Linkoping	Lingacopa.
Lisieux	Lexovium.
Lodi	Laus Pompeia.
Lombez	Lumbaria.
Lorri	Lauriacum.
Loudan	Lausdunum.
Lugo	Lucus.
Lyons	Lugdunum.
Macon	Matiscona.
Madrid	Madritense.
Maguelona	Magalona.
Maghfield	Magfeldium.

MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.
Malines	Mechlinia.	Palencia	Palentia.
Mans	Cenomanum.	Pampeluna	Pamphilona.
Mantala	Mantala.	Paris	Lutetia.
Mantua	Mantua.	Pavia	Ticinum, or Papia.
Marseilles	Massilia.		
Marsiac	Marchiacum.	Pennafiel	Penna-fidelis.
S. Maurice	Agaunum.	Perth	Perthum.
Mayence	Moguntia.	Pipwell Abbey	Pipewella.
S. Maxent	S. Maxentii fanum.	Pisa	Pisæ.
		Pistres	Pistæ.
Meaux	Meldi.	Placenza	Placentia.
Mehun	Magdunum.	Pont Audemer	Pons Audemari.
Melfi	Melphis.		
Melun	Melodunum.	Poitiers	Pictavium.
Merida	Emerita Augusta.	Poissi	Pisciacum.
		Portes	Villa Portus.
Merton	Mertona.	Presburg	Posonium.
Metz	Metæ.	Prague	Praga.
Milan	Mediolanum.		
Modena	Mutina.		
Montpellier	Mons-Pessulanus.	S. QUENTIN	Quintinopolis
Mont S. Marie	Mons S. Mariæ.		
		RATISBON	Ratisbona.
Moscow	Moscovia.	Ravenna	Ravenna.
Mouson	Mosomum.	Reading	Radinga.
		Rennes	Redonæ.
		Rheims	Rhemi.
NANTES	Nannetes.	Riez	Regium.
Napoli	Neapolis.	Riga	Riga.
Narbonne	Narbo.	Rochester	Roffa.
Nesterfield	Nesterfelda.	Rockingham	Rockingamia
Newmarket, or Neuf Marche*	Novus Mercatus.	Rouen	Rothomagus.
		Ruffee	Roffiacum.
Nid	Nidda.	S. Ruf.	S. Rufus.
Nismes	Nemausus.		
Noyon	Noviomum.		
		SAINTES	Santones.
		Salisbury	Sarum.
S. OMER	Audomaropolis.	Salzburg	Salisburgum.
		Sarragossa	Cæsar-Augusta.
Orleans	Aurelia.		
Oslaveslen*	Oslavesle-num.	Saumur	Salmurium.
		Savonieres	Saponariæ.
Orange	Arausio.	Schenning	Scheningia.
Oviedo	Ovetum.	Scone	Scoanum.
Oxford	Oxonium.	Seden	Sedenum.
		Selgenstad	Salegunstadium.
PADERBORN	Paderborna.	Senlis	Silvanectum.
Padua	Patavium.	Sens	Senonæ.

MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.	MODERN NAME.	LATIN NAME.
Seville	Hispalis.	URGEL	Urgellum.
Sienna	Senæ.	Uzes	Ucetia.
Siponto	Sipontum.		
Soissons	Suessiones.	VAISON	Vasio.
Soreze *	Sauriciacum	Valence	Valentia Segalaunorum.
Spalatro	Spalatium.		
Spoletto	Spoletum.	Valencia	Valentia Contestanorum.
Sutri	Sutrium.		
Synnada	Synnada.	Valladolid	Vallis Oleti.
Syon	Sedunum.	Vannes	Venetica.
		Venice	Venetiæ.
		Verberie	Vermeriæ.
TARRAGONA	Tarraco.	Verceilles	Vercellæ.
S. Thierri	S. Theoderi-cus.	Verdun	Virdunum.
		Vernun	Vernum.
Thionville	Theodonis Villa.	Vezelai	Veseliacum.
		Vienna	Vindobona.
Toledo	Toletum.	Vienne	Vienna Allobrogum.
Tortosa	Dertusa.		
Toul	Tullum.		
Toulouse	Tolosa.	WESTMINSTER	Westmonasterium.
Tournus	Trenorchium		
Tours	Turones.	Whitby	Pharum.
Tousi	Tousiacum.	Winchester	Vintonia.
Trani	Tranum.	Windsor	Windlesora.
Trent	Tridentum.	Worcester	Vigornia.
Treves	Treviri.	Worms	Vormatia.
Trosly	Trosleium.	Wurzburg	Virceburgum
Troyes	Trœcæ.		
Turin	Taurinum.	YORK	Eboracum.

APPENDIX III.

ON THE FORMS OBSERVED IN THE CELEBRATION OF COUNCILS[1].

Ecclesiastical Synods were usually held in churches; and it was customary early on the morning of the assembling of the council, to exclude every one from the church, and to fasten all the doors except one for the admission of the bishops.

At the time appointed the latter began to arrive in their pontifical vestments, and took their seats in a circle according to seniority, reckoning from the date of their consecration; after which the priests who were deputed to attend for absent bishops, or who had been called to the council, were admitted; the latter to seats behind the bishops, but the former sat upon the same seats with them. Frequently some of the order of deacons were present; these were not permitted to sit, but stood during the proceedings in front of the prelates. Notaries also attended to expedite the business of the synod.

All having taken their respective places, and the volume of the Holy Gospels and that of the canons of the Church being placed on a raised stand in the midst of the assembly, as soon as silence was obtained, an archdeacon, with a loud voice, exclaimed, "Let us pray;" upon which all present fell on their knees, and the president or one of the senior bishops offered up a prayer to God, that He would send the Holy Spirit to illumine them and guide them in their proceedings; and frequently litanies and the hymn "Veni, Creator," were sung. As soon as the prayers were concluded, and the archdeacon had directed them to "arise," all again took their seats in silence, and a deacon, vested in the alb, recited, at the command of the president, the canons and regulations relating to the order to be observed in such assemblies; by which, amongst other things, it was enacted, that any one disturbing the synod by noise, or quarrelling, or laughter, should be quietly removed, and placed for three days under sentence of excommunication. The fourth canon of fourth council of Toledo is the chief authority upon this subject. This done, the matters to be considered by the

[1] Respecting the constitution of our English synods, see the Dissertation upon that subject prefixed to Wilkins's Concilia, vol. i.

council were declared, and the president addressed the assembly, exhorting them peaceably and faithfully to apply themselves to the discussion of the questions about to be brought before them.

Usually these questions were introduced in the following order:—First, those relating to the faith; secondly, those relating to morality; and, lastly, those which concerned the discipline of the Church. In examining these questions the fathers had recourse to the advice and opinions of theologians, lawyers, and learned clerks of whatever degree, who could assist them in arriving at a right conclusion; and in cases relating to heresy, or any other crime, the parties accused were introduced, and permitted to plead their own cause. After any matter had been thus sufficiently canvassed, and each bishop, beginning at the president, had had an opportunity of delivering his opinion, the conclusion was pronounced by the president according to the majority of suffrages. Nor was it allowed to any prelate, under pain of excommunication, to withdraw until the whole was concluded.

The same order was observed during the other sessions.

The constitutions and decrees which had been agreed to in the council, having been revised and reconsidered in private congregation, were again, at the last session, publicly read through, and put to the suffrages of the fathers. After which each bishop subscribed the acts of the council, and occasionally, with the consent of the prelates, the priests and laymen present also signed; and prayer having been offered up for God's blessing upon their enactments, and for his pardon for all their deficiencies, the archdeacon exclaimed, "In Nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi eamus cum pace," whereupon all except the president arose, and having given to each other the kiss of peace, beginning at the president, the synod was dissolved.

Frequently a fast of three days was ordered to be observed immediately preceding the opening of the council.—*J. B. Ladvocat, Tractatus de Conciliis.*

APPENDIX IV.

From the REPORT OF THE STATE OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *presented in the Convocation at Philadelphia*, A.D. 1844.

EPISCOPAL ACTS.

DIOCESES.	BISHOPS.	Candidates for Orders.	Ordinations		Churches Consecrated	Confirmations.
			Deacons.	Priests.		
Maine	J. P. K. Henshaw, Provisional Bp.	5	[illegible]	. .	1	228
New Hampshire	Carlton Chase	3	. .	. .	1	71
Vermont	J. H. Hopkins	2	3	3	2	497
Massachusetts	M. Eastburn	13	13	9	. .	1380
Rhode Island	J. P. K. Henshaw	4	9	6	1	560
Connecticut	T. C. Brownell	19	13	20	9	2163
New York	B. T. Onderdonk	51	36	31	19	4072
West. New York	W. H. De Lancey	21	7	11	14	1703
New Jersey	G. W. Doane	. .	. .	. .	4	
Pennsylvania	. . . .	26	23	11	12	2842
Delaware	Alfred Lee	3	3	1	2	264
Maryland	W. R. Whittingham	18	13	18	10	1582
Virginia	William Meade, John Johns	. .	30	17	23	2000
North Carolina	L. S. Ives	6	10	13	[illegible]	916
South Carolina	C. E. Gadsden	13	7	8	6	837
Georgia	S. Elliott, Jr.	5	5	3	7	286
Florida	S. Elliott, Jr., Provisional Bishop	. .	. .	. .	. .	62
Alabama	N. H. Cobbs	. .	. .	. .	3	69
Mississippi	J. H. Otey, Provisional Bishop	. .	. .	. .	2	298
Louisiana	Leonidas Polk	. .	. .	. .	1	
Tennessee	J. H. Otey	4	1	2	3	145
Kentucky	B. B. Smith	. .	4	5	. .	254
Ohio	C. P. M'Ilvaine	. .	8	13	6	1156
Indiana	Jackson Kemper, Provisional Bp.					
Illinois	Philander Chase	[illegible]	3	1	4	250
Michigan	S. A. M'Crosky	4	2	4	. .	419
Missouri	C. S. Hawks					

SUMMARY AND COMPARATIVE VIEW.

1835.	1838.	1841.	1844.
Churches consecrated, 123	. . 168	. . 93	. . 143
Priests ordained, 136 } 333	179 } 393	168 } 355	176 } 367
Deacons ordained, 197 }	214 }	187 }	191 }
Candidates for Orders, 165	. . 188	. . 155	. . 203
Confirmation . . 10,277	. 11,866	. 14,767	. 22,215

ABSTRACT OF PAROCHIAL REPORTS.

DIOCESES.	Clergy.	Parishes.	Families.	BAPTISMS.				COMMUNICANTS.		Marriages.	Funerals.	SUNDAY SCHOOLS.		Churches being built.	Clergy died.
				Adults.	Infants.	Not specified.	Total.	Added.	Total.			Pupils.	Teachers		
Maine	8	6	...	107	185	...	292	225	485	...	...	528	74	1	
New Hampshire	...	...	450	30	120	...	150	...	500	51	116	500	70	...	1
Vermont	21	33	841	169	389	...	558	494	1536	119	275	...			
Massachusetts	58	...	...	472	1413	...	1885	...	4386	...	...	3662	...	...	2
Rhode Island	24	21	...	355	350	135	840	...	2116	200	450	2000	300	2	
Connecticut	101	97	6314	872	1880	...	2752	...	7467	910	1924	5100	794		
New York	198	164	...	1274	7393	364	9031	3164	13436	2301	4434	8598	986	...	12
Western New York	107	116	...	730	2287	...	3017	...	5369	990	1017	3013	517		
New Jersey	50	46	...	305	1006	...	1311	...	1946	...	...	...	...	9	3
Pennsylvania	121	117	6000	1022	4550	...	5572	3706	8865	1175	1890	9305	1196	...	4
Delaware	10	17	...	74	287	...	361	269	538	61	142	915	87	...	4
Maryland	100	96	...	269	3542	559	5360	1762	6193	1190	1698	3799	615	11	
Virginia	...	...	...	359	1891	...	2250	1200	5000	...	...				
North Carolina	30	40	...	...	...	...	1829	...	1711	...	...				
South Carolina	50	45	...	699	1963	...	...	...	3535	319	644	2271	254	...	2
Georgia	20	17	...	...	...	...	565	398	700	...	...	572	73		
Florida	7	9	...	...	...	...	203	...	182	4	87	162	34		
Alabama	14	20	...	...	...	...	319	...	349	68	129	187	37	3	
Mississippi	16	...	309	235	602	...	837	...	297	74	111	...	...	...	3
Louisiana	11	...	...	...	...	...	527	...	331	120	288	...	...	1	
Tennessee	12	13	...	108	204	...	...	...	650	31	75				
Kentucky	23	...	...	114	366	...	480	210	565	...	...				
Ohio	57	78	...	402	1339	...	1741	1534	3734	352	731	...	...	10	
Indiana	14	22	246	...	...	...	308	178	379	44	119	...			
Illinois	19	...	...	...	...	...	610	360	710	...	...		...	2	
Michigan	25	31	...	211	477	...	688	...	1119	...	...				
Missouri	...	9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...				

SUMMARY AND COMPARATIVE VIEW OF CHIEF ITEMS.

1835.

Clergy in 19 Dioceses			763
Baptisms	Adults in 11 Dioceses	2,021	
	Infants in 11 Dioceses	10,371	21,849
	Not specified in 9 Dioceses	9,457	
Communicants added in 6 Dioceses			2,136
Total of Communicants in 19 Dioceses			36,416
Marriages in 11 Dioceses			5,436
Burials in 11 Dioceses			8,774
Sunday Scholars in 11 Dioceses			28,661
Sunday School Teachers in 9 Dioceses			3,059
Clergy deceased in 8 Dioceses			22

1838.

Clergy in 25 Dioceses			951
Baptisms	Adults in 12 Dioceses	2,522	
	Infants in 12 Dioceses	14,964	18,758
	Not specified in 2 Dioceses	1,272	
Communicants added in 4 Dioceses			7,280
Total of communicants in 23 Dioceses			45,930
Marriages in 13 Dioceses			5,719
Burials in 13 Dioceses			10,588
Sunday-School Teachers in 9 Dioceses			4,367
Sunday-School Pupils in 13 Dioceses			39,443
Clergy deceased in 8 Dioceses			27

1841.

Clergy in 25 Dioceses			1,052
Baptisms	Adults in 14 Dioceses	4,729	
	Infants in 14 Dioceses	22,496	34,465
	Not specified in 9 Dioceses	7,240	
Communicants added in 9 Dioceses			3,678
Total of Communicants in 25 Dioceses			55,477
Marriages in 17 Dioceses			8,604
Burials in 14 Dioceses			14,961
Sunday-School Teachers in 10 Dioceses			3,974
Sunday-School Pupils in 11 Dioceses			32,265
Clergy deceased in 11 Dioceses			28

1844.

Clergy in 24 Dioceses (number in 3 Dioceses not reported)			1,096
Baptisms	Adults in 19 Dioceses	7,807	
	Infants in 19 Dioceses	30,254	39,119
	Not specified in 3 Dioceses	1,058	
Communicants added in 12 Dioceses			12,490
Total of Communicants in 26 Dioceses			72,099
Marriages in 17 Dioceses			8,036
Burials in 17 Dioceses			14,330
Sunday-School Teachers in 13 Dioceses			5,037
Sunday-School Pupils in 14 Dioceses			40,012
Clergy deceased in 8 Dioceses			31

FUNDS AND COLLECTIONS.

DIOCESES.	Domestic and Foreign Missions.	Diocesan Missions.	General Contributions for Church Objects.	Fund for the Relief of Aged and Infirm Clergymen.	Episcopal Fund.	Widows and Orphans of Clergymen.	Fund of the Society for advancement of Christianity.
Maine	1,470 61	550 00					
New Hampshire	...	...	987 56				
Vermont	741 95	107 87	2,803 20				
Massachusetts	15,000 00	...	38,854 83				
Rhode Island	6,000 00	5,500 00	10,000 00				
Connecticut							
New York	...	...	166,172 72	4,383 76			
Western New York	...	...	3,500 00	3,000 00	36,527 00		
New Jersey	...	...	3,839 16		9,300 00	22,000 00	
Pennsylvania							
Delaware	698 10						
Maryland	11,930 00	...	4,390 59½				
Virginia							
North Carolina				300 00	16,831 03	60,000 00	59,969 50
South Carolina	...	...	...				
Georgia	...	...	9,906 44				
Florida							
Alabama	...	...	4,271 57				
Mississippi	...	...	8,574 00				
Louisiana	...	...	2,933 00				
Tennessee							
Kentucky	...	...	1,277 00				
Ohio	2,100 00	2,700 00	15,000 00				
Indiana	140 12						
Illinois							
Michigan							
Missouri							

APPENDIX V.

C. ARLES A.D. 314.

In this council twenty-two canons were published, of which the contents are as follows:—

1. That Easter be celebrated on one day and at one time every where.
2. That every one should remain where he was ordained.
3. That those who, in peace [1], throw away their arms, be excommunicated.
4. That charioteers, while they continue their calling, be separated from communion.
5. That performers in the theatre, while they continue to act, be likewise separated.
6. That those who are converted in sickness receive imposition of hands.
7. Concerning the faithful, when they hold public offices in the state.
8. Concerning the baptism of those that are converted from heresy.
9. Orders that those who bear letters of confessors shall receive letters of communion instead of them.
10. Forbids one, whose wife has been guilty of adultery, to take another wife during her lifetime.
11. Orders young women who have married heathens to be excommunicated for a time.
12. Orders that those clergy who are guilty of usury be excommunicated.
13. Concerning those who are said to have delivered up the Holy Scriptures, the sacred vessels, or the names of the brethren.
14. Orders those who falsely accuse their brethren, to be excommunicated even to their death.
15. Forbids deacons to offer, as in many places had been allowed.
16. Orders that a man shall be received into communion again in the same place where he was excommunicated.
17. Forbids one bishop to trample upon another.
18. Concerning the deacons of cities, repressing their presumption, and forbidding them to do any thing without the knowledge of the presbyters.
19. Orders that a place for offering be afforded to bishops from other parts, who come to a city.

[1] Some read (and more probably) "in war," or "in battle."

20. Forbids the ordination of any bishop except by seven other bishops; or, if this be impossible, by three at the very least.

21. Orders that presbyters or deacons who remove themselves to another place to which they were not ordained, be deposed.

22. Concerning apostates, who, in sickness, seek restoration to Church communion.

INDEX.

The numbers refer to the dates of the Councils.

A.

Abelard, Sens, 1140.
Acacius condemned, Rome, 484.
Acephalists, Seville, 618.
Albigenses—Arles, 1234 ; Avignon, 1209 ; Montpelier, 1224 ; Paris, 1226.
America, first council in, Mexico, 1524.
America, Church in the United States of, Philadelphia, 1789, *et seq.*
Apollinarians, Rome, 374.
Arians—Ancyra, 358 ; Antioch, 341 ; Ariminum, 359 ; Milan, 346, 347. 355 ; Nicea, 325 ; Paris, 360 ; Rome, 366 ; Saragossa, 592 ; Seleucia, 359.
Aristotle condemned, Paris, 1210.
Arius — Alexandria, 321 ; Angers, 1448.
Arnulphus, his condemnation and protest against Rome, Rheims, 991.
Athanasius — Alexandria, 340. 362, 363; Antioch, 341; Arles, 353 ; Jerusalem, 349 ; Rome, 342 ; Sardica, 347.
Athanasian Creed, Autun, 677.

B.

Baptism — Africa, 217 ; Arles, 314; Carthage, 253. 255 ; Synnada, 230.
Barnard, St., Vezelai, 1146.
Barromeo, Milan, 1565. 1569. 1573, *et seq.*
Battle Abbey, Chichester, 1157 ; Poitiers, 1073.
Becket, archbishop, Clarendon, 1164 ; Tours, 1163.
Bell-ringing, Cologne, 1310, *note.*
Beranger—Angers, 1055 ; Bordeaux, 1080 ; Brionne, 1050 ; Paris, 1050 ; Placenza, 1095 ; Rome, 1050. 1079.
Bishops, translation of, forbidden, Sardica, 347.
Bogomili, Constantinople, 1118. 1143.
Boniface, VIII., Rome, 1302.
British Church, England, 603. 693.

C.

Calvinism anathematized by the Eastern Church, Constantinople, 1633. 1642.
Calvinism, introduced into the Articles of the Irish Church, Dublin, 1615.
Canon of Scripture, Carthage, 397.
Canonization, first act of Rome, 537.
Charlemagne canonized, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1165.
Chorepiscopi, Aix-la-Chapelle, 802.
Chorepiscopi, Ratisbon, 796.
Chrysostom, St., Constantinople, 403 ; Quercus, 403.
Church Reform attempted by cardinal Pole in England, London, 1557.
Church Reform under archbishop Parker in England, London, 1562.

Civil authority in matters ecclesiastical, Avignon, 1236.
Clarke, S., censured, London, 1714.
Clergy, irregularities of, Rouen, 1299.
Clergy, licentiousness of, Pavia, 1022.
Communion in both kinds, Cologne, 1536 ; Constance, 1415.
Common Prayer, book of, revised, London, 1661.
Confirmation of Infants, Arles, 1261.
Consecration by less than three bishops invalid, Riez, 439.
Council of the One Hundred Chapters, Moscow, 1551.
Crusade proclaimed, Clermont, 1095.
Cyprian, St., Carthage, 255.

D.

Disinterment usual before canonization, Beauvais, 1120.
Donatists—Africa, 401. 403. 405. 407. 418 ; Carthage, 348. 401. 411 ; Cirta, 412 ; Rome, 313.
Dunstan—Brentford, 963; Calne, 979 ; Canterbury, 969.

E.

Easter — Africa, 393 ; Cesarea, 197 ; Ephesus, 196 ; Lyons, 197 ; Palestine, 196 ; Rome, 196 ; Whitby, 664.
Eon, an English fanatic, Rheims, 1148.
Eritta, Lucca, 1062.
Eustathians — Alexandria, 362 ; Gangra, about 379.
Eutyches—Chalcedon, 451 ; Constantinople, 418 ; Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449.

F.

Faustus, Arles, 475.
Felicissimus, Africa, 254.
Felix of Urgel condemned, Ratisbon, 792.
Flavianus, death of, Latrocinium Ephesinum, 449.
Friars, Paris, 1281.

G.

Godfrey, Beauvais, 1114.
Goths, conversion of from Arianism, Toledo, 589.
Greek Church, its belief in the Seventeenth Century, Bethlehem, 1672.
Gregory VII., Brixen, 1080 ; Rome, 1074. 1076. 1078, &c.
Gregory XII., Aquilea, 1409.
Gregory Nazianzen, Constantinople, 381.

H.

Hanover, prayers for the house of, Aberdeen, 1788.
Helcesaitans, Arabia, 247.
Henry II. of England, Avranches, 1172.
Hoadley censured, London, 1717.
Hosius, Alexandria, 319.
Huss, John, Constance, 1414.

I.

Images—Aix-la-Chapelle, 825 ; Constantinople, 730, *et seq.* ; Francfort, 794 ; Mayence, 1549 ; Nicea, 787 ; Paris, 825 ; Poissi, 1561.
Inquisition, its commencement, Besiers, 1246 ; Verona, 1184.
Infant Communion, Bordeaux, 1255.
Incarnation, doctrine of, approved at Chalcedon, 451.
Innocentius III., Lateran, 1215.
Irish Canons, Dublin, 1634.

J.

Jerome of Prague, Constance, 1414.
Jews, Cologne, 1452.
Joachimites, Arles, 1261.
John XXIII. (pope), Constance, 1414.
Jovinian, Milan, 390.
Julius II., Pisa and Milan, 1511.

L.

Lapsed, Rome, 313. 487.
Leo, St., Chalcedon, 451.
Lichfield, archbishopric of, abolished, Cloves-hoo, 803.

Limbomastix, the book so called, London, 1604.
Lollards condemned, Oxford, 1408.
Lord's Prayer, allowed to be said to the saints, Edinburgh, 1552.
Louis le Debonnaire, Attigni, 822.
Louis, St., Compiegne, 1235.
Louis, St., Noyon, 1233.
Lucidus, Arles, 475.
Lutherans condemned, Paris, 1528.

M.

Macedonius, Constantinople, 362. 381.
Manichæans, Charroux, 1028.
Marriage of the clergy forbidden, Barcelona, 1068; Mayence, 1075.
Massalians, Antioch, 391.
Meletius deposed, Alexandria, 306.
Meletus of Sebastia, Antioch, 360. 363.
Mellitus, Rome, 610.
Michael Paleologus, Constantinople, 1261. 1266.
Monastic privileges, Lateran, 1512.
Monothelites—Africa, 645. 646; Constantinople, 680; Lateran, 649.
Moscow, patriarchate of, Constantinople, 1593.

N.

Nestorius, Alexandria, 430; Antioch, 433; Ephesus, 431.
Nestorians, Constantinople, 546. 430.
Nicene Canon invented by the pope, Africa, 419. 424. 525; Chalcedon, 451.
Nilcon, Moscow, 1655. 1667.
Novatian, Antioch, 252.
Novatus, Africa, 254.

O.

Ordeal, sanctioned by a council, Mayence, 1028; Ravenna, 1310.
Origen deposed, Alexandria, 230. 401.
Origenists condemned, Jerusalem, 399.
Otto or Otho, the pope's legate, London, 1237, 1238.
Oxford, poverty of, London, 1328; privileges of, Reading, 1279.

P.

Papal privilege—Anse, 1025; Basle, 1432; Douzi, 871; Fimes, 881; Lateran, 1112, *et seq.*; London, 1107. 1297; Melun, 1216; Paris, 1302; Pontyon, 876; Rome, 496. 774; Tours, 1510.
Papal exactions in England, Lyons, 1245.
Patronage-Lay, condemned, Dalmatia, 1199.
Patronage of Churches, origin of, Orleans, 541.
Paul of Samosata, Antioch, 264.
Pelagians—Africa, 418; Arles, 428; Carthage, 412. 416. 418; Cilicia, 423; Diospolis, 415; England, 519; Milevi, 416; Orange, 529; St. Albans, 429.
Philip of France, Autun, 1094.
Photinus, Sirmium, 351.
Photius, Constantinople, 869; Rome, 863. 868.
Pope, election of, Rome, 1059; first use of the title, Toledo, 400.
Populicani condemned, Sens, 1199.
Pragmatic Sanction, Bourges, 1438; Lateran, 1512.
Priscillianists persecuted, Bordeaux, 385; Saragossa, 590; Toledo, 400. 447.
Procession of the Holy Spirit—Aix-la-Chapelle, 809; Bari, 1097; Constantinople, 280, *et seq.*; Friuli, 796; Toledo, 447.

Q.

Quietists, Constantinople, 1341.

R.

Reprobation (absolute) condemned, Mayence, 848.

Rome, alleged necessity of communion with, Beneventum, 1087.
Roscelin, Soissons, 1092.

S.

Schism between the Eastern and Western branches of the Church—Constantinople, 879. 1054. 1277, *et seq.*; Ferrara, 1438; Florence, 1439; Gentilly, 767; Nymphæum, 1234.
Schism in the papacy—Lausanne, 1449; Mantua, 1067; Montpelier, 1162; Paris, 1395. 1398. 1408; Pisa, 1134. 1409; Placenza, 1132; Rheims, 1119. 1131.
Seats in Churches, Exeter, 1287.
Simony, Rheims, 1049.
Sunday Schools, Malines, 1570.

T.

Templars—Mayence, 1310; Paris, 1310; Ravenna, 1310; Vienne, 1311.
Theodosius of Mopsuestia, Antioch, 435; Cilicia, 423; Constantinople, 538. 553; Mopsuestia, 550; Ephesus, 431.
Theopaschitæ, Rome, 862.
Thomas à Becket, Northampton, 1164.
Tithes, fourfold division of, Saltzburg, 806.
Titles, particular, of images forbidden, Rouen, 1445.
Tournaments opposed, Halle, 1176.
Traditores, Cirta, 305.
Trève de Dieu, Elne, 1065; Gaul, 1041; Gerona, 1068; Limoges, 103[illegible], &c.

U.

Union of British and Eastern Churches, Constantinople, A.D. 1718. 1723.
Usages, ancient, dispute about in Scotland, Edinburgh, 1724. 1731.

V.

Vestments, priestly, Coaco, 1050; in use in England, Merton, 1305.
Virgin Mary, immaculate conception of, Avignon, 1457; Basle, 1439.
Vizier in Egypt sits in judgment upon the patriarch Cyril, Cairo.

W.

Weights, illegal, London, 1430.
Whiston, W., censured, London, 1710.
Wicliff, Constance, 1414; London, 1382. 1413. 1416; Saltzburg, 1418.
Wihtred, king, Dooms of, Berghamsted, 696.
Wilfrid, Rome, 678. 703.

Y.

York and Canterbury, dispute between the archbishops respecting precedence, London, 1237; Westminster, 1176.

Z.

Zosimus, Africa, 418, 419; Carthage, 418.

THE END.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

21047

BX821 .L3 / copy 1
Landon, Edward H.
A manual of councils of the Holy Cathol

21047

Landon.
Manual of ...
BX
821
L3

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

21047

PRINTED IN U.S.A.